20c • DECEMBER 21, 1953

CHINA TRADE—HAS McCARTHY A CASE?

New Republic

Eisenhower's Atomic Plan

DEC 18 1953
The Carrie C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

Will It Bring Peace?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

T. R. B. *Washington Wire*

Eisenhower has reached his point of no return. Either he takes leadership now or loses it for good. Which will it be? The next few weeks should tell.

After frittering away a year, Ike has seized the initiative. He has won a victory from McCarthy, and he has given an inspiring example of world leadership in his bold, imaginative program for an atomic pool for peace. He has told his own party that it doesn't deserve to hold office if it can't evolve and enact a "progressive, dynamic" program. At a three-day legislative conference at the White House this week Ike will try to produce such a program. The time is short, for Congress meets next month.

Has Ike finally learned how to be President? His hold is on the people, not on Congress. The GOP right-wing in Congress is closer to McCarthy than to Ike. Sen. William Knowland (R, Calif.), the Majority Leader without a majority, has not broken with McCarthy and supports his views on trade with China in principle and on making Communism the 1954 election issue.

Ike has other problems. The era of eager Democratic co-operation has ended, the division over foreign policy is growing within the Republican Party and, finally, all the issues postponed from last year must now be met. This means that Ike at last must choose sides on controversies. Every time he takes sides he alienates some minority. These are Ike's problems.

But not to act is far worse. He cannot permit the picture of his Administration to continue one of indecision, ineffectiveness and postponement. A feeling has developed in Washington that Ike will quit after one term; it is a way of expressing the view that Ike isn't really trying. "Has the Administration lived up to its campaign promises?" asked the Gallup Poll. Of those who answered, 45 percent said "No"; only 40 percent said "Yes." Democratic thoughts were expressed aptly by Stevenson at Philadelphia: "I only wish President Eisenhower could speak for the Eisenhower Administration!"

Ike's strength lies with the people. His only chance now is to give not merely leadership but militant leadership. For success he must do what strong Presidents have always done and weak Presidents refrained from doing—appeal over the heads of Congress to the people.

One decision has already been taken; it involves finances. What the Administration's budget comes down to is this: we're going to save money by cutting down on the fire insurance. In other words, we're to cut taxes at the expense of national defense. We are also cutting down promised defense aid to Europe to the alarm of our allies there; one armored division promised NATO for 1954 has already, apparently, been lopped off. Anyone who objects to this national defense reduction will be told (a) with a General in the White House we can be sure of adequate defense; (b) there's a lot of waste in defense anyway; and (c) atomic weapons will reduce costs.

These are all plausible arguments. Yet how much more conviction they would carry if the Administration were not caught in a bear trap! It over-promised itself to win in 1952 with pledges of a balanced budget, and now it can't deliver. It faces a whopping deficit and must cut the insurance to use the cash elsewhere. Reasons for cutting may be legitimate, just as the statements of a man whose arm is being twisted may happen to be true—but that *is not evidence; it is coincidence.*

America's dispersal of its armies after World Wars I and II were among its greatest mistakes. The temptation in a democracy to let the insurance lapse is almost irresistible. This suspicious old column has always believed in lots of defense. We hate to lecture conservatives about not trusting Communists because they have always felt they had a monopoly on this in lecturing liberals. Yet it is the conservatives who now argue America can't "afford" to protect herself. The answer to this is simply, bosh. What they mean is that they have campaign promises to meet: trimming armies at home and cutting aid abroad will mean a nice cut in upper-bracket income taxes next year—and Moscow won't attack anyway. "Trust Moscow!" is the conservatives' sinister new slogan.

The Brownell attempt to kidnap the spy witch-hunt from McCarthy seems to have failed. McCarthy's bold appeal to flood the White House with telegrams of protest was a flop—as many telegrams came favoring Ike as against him—but on the other hand the Senator has kept his various espionage investigations all going furiously and still personifies spy-hunting for the man in the street. Washington is now pretty confident that McCarthy's real goal is the Presidency and that a break with Ike is inevitable. The GOP right-wing will probably accept McCarthy as its speaker.

We spent several days last week at McCarthy's hearings. Two things impressed us. There is greater and greater reference to supposedly "secret" FBI material which is theoretically kept from Congressional committees. And there is a stronger and stronger attempt by McCarthy to find out and pillory members of now-secret loyalty boards who happen to have found suspects innocent whom he calls "guilty."

Both moves are in the direction of the police state, what Adlai Stevenson at Philadelphia called the new "ugly, alien mood of America" with "four fears" replacing FDR's Four Freedoms. McCarthy would convict men with unevaluated, unsworn police material, and he would also intimidate the judges. It is fascinating to see the resemblance between Communism and McCarthyism.

Outside of Washington last week underpaid teachers in Garfield, N. J., started a strike that closed nine schools. We know nothing about this particular strike, but we do sympathize with teachers. What a land of opportunity America is, after all, where every child knows he may rise from garbage collector to school teacher—if he'll take a salary cut.

Notes: After a flirtation with the US Chamber of Commerce's attack on social security, the GOP is hastily backing off; it's amazed at the violence of Labor's disapproval. . . . Any formula that brings Moscow into Ike's atomic energy pool automatically counts McCarthy out; he will fight Soviet inclusion.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Noteworthy This Week

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

Communist Strategy

AFTER seven weeks of talk, the Chinese and North Korean Communists have deliberately broken down negotiations for an international political conference on Korea. It may be assumed that their Russian advisers agreed to the action. Why?

The conference was to be the instrument by which pressure would be applied on the West to acquiesce to certain Chinese political demands involving the UN, Formosa and Southeast Asia. If the Communist strategists have now decided that such a conference must be postponed it can only be because they hope to find themselves in a stronger position to negotiate at some much later date.

The economic situation of North Korea is desperate, and China has been bitterly disappointed in her drive for industrialization. Possibly the eagerness of Western nations to increase their China trade in non-strategic goods, and the tendency of Japan to object to the strategic "lists" as they are now composed, has encouraged the Communists to believe that a conflict between the trade policies of the US and its allies will strengthen them economically while the West is weakened politically. If so, it seems that the Communists are gambling that extremists in the US will seize control of United States policy and keep it rigid in the face of changing conditions.

Why?

THE Department of Defense is negotiating a $200 million contract which would concentrate our entire production of M-48 tanks in one firm — General Motors. The danger of narrowing our "mobilization base" in the atomic age has been emphasized many times, and the destruction of General Motors' entire Hydramatic production by one fire at its Livonia, Michigan, plant dramatized that danger. But the Pentagon explains this further concentration of production by the magic word "economy." The General Motors bid, it seems, was about 15 percent below that of the Chrysler Corporation, the only other company now producing M-48 tanks.

The explanation raises more questions than it answers. The government has some 15 specified sources for parts that go into the M-48. Ten of these sources are divisions of General Motors. Do these GM subsidiaries ask the same price from GM as from its competitors? If not, would the difference account for the lower General Motors bid?

Chrysler's bid reflected plans to use small, independent suppliers scattered through 39 states. The government has just granted these suppliers some $50 million in tax-amortization arrangements to bring them into the defense program and thus widen the production base.

Are future contracts from manufacturers planning to use the facilities of these small firms to be rejected because corporations with vast subsidiary holdings can underbid them? And why are tax-amortization arrangements being made if the recipient firms are not to be brought actively into the Defense programs?

It would seem that only a Congressional hearing can supply answers to these and similar questions. And Sen. Estes Kefauver (D, Tenn.), a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has called upon Committee Chairman Leverett Saltonstall (R, Mass.) to hold such hearings.

I didn't really want to blow your house in anyhow.

The Greater Loyalty

THE SUPREME COURT has given labor another strict lesson in how hard it is to win a case in the courts in the post-Taft-Hartley world. A small group of technicians at a Charlotte, N. C., television station, fighting their employer over a labor contract, published a handbill attacking the quality of the local TV programs afforded the public. Although many harassed viewers might consider this a distinct public service, the NLRB upheld the employer's discharge of the technicians in an unfair labor practice case. The Labor Board reasoned that the technicians' conduct was "indefensible," and promptly found itself reversed by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The Court wanted the NLRB to take another look and find some legal standard on which to make a ruling, rather than on a vague concept like "indefensible conduct."

The Supreme Court, with six justices upholding the Board, fired a shotgun blast at the technicians without any analysis of the legal issues raised in the dissent of Justice Frankfurter. Such ungracious disloyalty was sufficient cause for discharge, said the majority, and the fact that the parties were involved in a toe-to-toe labor dispute was lightly brushed aside.

Frankfurter's dissent, which agreed with the Court of Appeals that the NLRB should be required to make another ruling, deftly pointed up the significant issues overlooked by the majority. "To float such imprecise notions as 'discipline' and 'disloyalty' in the context of labor controversies, as the basis of the right to discharge, is to open the door wide to individual judgment by Board members and judges." Then to the real heart of the case, to treat the offensive

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

handbills here as though they were circulated by the technicians as interloping outsiders to the sustained dispute between them and their employer is a very unreal way of looking at the circumstances of a labor controversy."

Unreal ways of looking at labor controversies in the courts, as common today as before the Norris-LaGuardia Act, is one more judicial extension where the 80th Congress left off. Before the judges are finished, unions may be as suspicious of the courts as they were in the times of Sam Gompers and the labor injunction.

Only 10 Percent?

WHEN President Eisenhower and his legislative advisers come to consider an anti-recession program for the new Congress, they will have a handy definition provided them by Deputy Secretary of the Treasury W. Randolph Burgess.

When does an economic "readjustment" become a "recession" serious enough to call for government action? Burgess was asked in an interview with the editors of *U.S. News*. "There anybody can make his own definition," says Mr. Burgess. "If it's 5 percent, it's a readjustment; if it's 25 or 30 percent, it's a recession. Now, there's some place in between there where you draw the line to your own taste."

Presumably a 10-percent decline in the economy would fall in that "some place in between" which Mr. Burgess does not consider recessionary. But Leon H. Keyserling, Chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisors, explained to a national Conference on Unemployment called by the CIO United Auto Workers why "10 percent" could be a much more alarming drop than Mr. Burgess indicated.

A decline of 10 percent in the economy would mean:

—a loss of national output in the neighborhood of $340 billion. (Our total output, under near full employment conditions, recently reached roughly $375 billion, and would be close to $390 billion by 1954 if full employment were maintained.)

—a 10-percent drop in employment, or a loss of more than six million jobs. (This figure added to the approximately 1.5 million now unemployed, and to an annual increase of close to one million in the labor force, would mean nine million unemployed by the end of 1954.)

—a cut in the revenues of the federal government by far more than 10 percent would put the federal budget out of balance by at least another $8 to $10 billion over the approximately $5 billion imbalance we will have next year even if full employment is maintained.

—considerable havoc to the economies of our foreign allies which might encourage them to break their ties with the US and swing to neutralism, or to trade with the Soviet bloc. (The moderate downturn of 1949, although our total output in 1949 was as high as that of 1948, did enormous damage to the processes of recovery and trade adjustment in Western Europe.)

Keyserling's statistics point up the choice facing the Eisenhower Administration: can the economy be stimulated, if and when needed, primarily on the basis of the free enterprise system? In other words, will reduced taxes, and the increased consumer and investment spending do the job? Or should the government begin now to take definite steps to insure not only that employment remains at present levels, but that business investment and personal consumption continue to grow?

Plug That Hole

ATTORNEY-GENERAL Herbert Brownell has reassured the nation that persons suspected of Communistic tendencies probably "are all out of government now," and the President of General Electric has declared, with the air of announcing a brand new policy, that employees found engaging "in any form of espionage or sabotage" will be fired, immediately.

But the new Administration is not going to leave anything to chance. Robert L. Applegate, Director of the Department of Defense's Industrial Security Division has drawn attention to a gaping loop-hole. His division can investigate and bar persons in defense work, yet it cannot investigate men and women working in plants doing civilian work. Obviously, says Applegate, in time of war these plants may well receive defense contracts. Think of it. All those uninvestigated people.

Having thought of it, several Congressmen have proposed legislation allowing the Department of Defense to investigate persons not involved in defense work.

New Republic DECEMBER 21, 1953 TABLE OF CONTENTS VOLUME 129 NUMBER 21 ISSUE 2039 WASHINGTON, DC

EDITOR, Michael Straight
CHAIRMAN, Editorial Board: Bruce Bliven
PUBLISHER: Gilbert A. Harrison
MANAGING EDITOR: Helen Fuller
LITERARY EDITOR: Robert Richman

STAFF WRITERS: Tom Fitzsimmons, Arnold J. Heidenheimer (on leave with the Armed Services)

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: F. R. Ruskin

COPY ASSISTANT: Lucille Davis

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Eric Bentley, Drama Critic; Malcolm Cowley; Robert Evett, Music Critic.

CONTRIBUTING CRITICS: W. H. Auden, Dudley Fitts, Joseph Frank, Kimon Friar, Gerald W. Johnson, V. O. Key Jr., Max Lerner, Richard Lester, Arthur Mizener, James R. Newman, Kathleen Raine, John Crowe Ransom, Herbert Read, Mark Schorer, Stephen Spender, Allen Tate

Washington Wire by T. R. B. 2
Behind the Headlines 3
The President's Atomic Plan 5
an editorial
China Trade—"Bloody" or Wise? 9
by Tom Fitzsimmons
What We Want of Our Teachers 11
by William Heard Kilpatrick
A Sharp Tongue, a Hot Temper and a Tender Heart 14
by Paul H. Douglas
The Superficial Aspect 16
by Gerald W. Johnson
Paul Blanshard, *Irish-Catholic Power* 17
reviewed by Padraic Colum
Journals of Lewis and Clark 18
reviewed by William O. Douglas
Books on Music 20
reviewed by Robert Evett
New Art Books 20
reviewed by Robert Richman

Photo credits: Front cover, Joint Task Force One; page 14, Karsch

Published weekly and Copyrighted, 1953 in the USA by New Republic, Inc., publishing office, 301 N St., N.E., Washington 2, D.C. Editorial communications should be addressed to 1824 Jefferson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Business communications should be addressed to 230 West 41st St., New York 36, N.Y. Entered as second-class matter September 26, 1950 at the post office at Washington, D.C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Single copy, 20c; Yearly subscription, $7.00; Foreign, $8.00

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A JOURNAL OF OPINION New Republic

Editorial: The President's Atomic Plan

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER spoke to the United Nations Assembly in the spirit of a man searching for peace. His manner was moderate, his approach was charitable, his conclusion was hopeful. The world is in need of these qualities after years of tension and violence. So the response of most non-Communist nations was kindly. Even the Kremlin, while it treated the President's review of atomic weapons as a threat rather than as a plea, promised to study the new plan.

But what is it that the Kremlin is asked to study? The President presented to the United Nations a "new conception" for the control and development of atomic energy. This "new conception" in contrast to the President's general manner must be considered in the specific and ambitious terms in which it is presented. It is the first major proposal in world affairs originating with the Eisenhower Administration. It is a declaration of policy by the leader of the non-Communist nations on the most critical problem they face. It is, supposedly, an alternative to the atomic arms race. And already this nation has greeted it as a plan for peace. If the Kremlin turns it down, then that will be further proof of its wickedness.

Does the President's plan bear analysis in these terms? If it is analyzed as policy rather than propaganda, if it is reviewed in the concrete terms as they are presented to the Kremlin, it seems probable that the "new conception" may do more harm than good, in ignoring harsh realities, raising false hopes and introducing new risks.

Why A "New Conception"?

It is entirely unclear whether the President's new conception is offered as an addition to the old conception, or in its place. While the President does not repudiate previous plans, he ignores them and implies that they are obsolete. The term "new conception" suggests that we are starting over.

But the "old conception" is not ours to discard. It is the Majority Plan of the United Nations, and it is part of the central stand of the Western World on the great issue of peace.

The great assumption of the United States and the UN majority has been their understanding that war has become too costly to be entrusted to the whims, errors and ambitions of sovereign states. Our great stand has been the commitment to prohibit war by enforceable disarmament in weapons of mass destruction.

When the most terrible of these weapons was developed by the US, we held to our commitment, offering to surrender sovereignty over atomic energy to a world authority. In this, all technicalities apart, we cut through to the essential truth that, at a time when warfare can destroy mankind, no nation can long be permitted the power to wage atomic war.

Seven years have eaten away at the political basis of the Majority Plan, but they have not diminished the brilliance of vision and the soundness of fundamental approach of the authors of the Majority Plan.

They understood that atomic energy represented a twin challenge—of promise and danger. So they prepared "a system of safeguards built around . . . hopeful prospects."

They realized that the US monopoly of atomic weapons was a wasting asset and that time was of the utmost urgency in seeking an enforceable agreement.

They were fully aware of the promise of atomic power, (in fact they may be criticized for over-emphasizing its promise). They affirmed correctly that because the threat outweighed the promise in today's world, the development of atomic power must be a part of a larger plan.

They concluded that a fool-proof control system was vital. In explaining why enforceable inspection in itself was inadequate, the authors of the Acheson-Lilienthal Report stated for all time why anything less than enforceable inspection may be fatal:

> National rivalries in the development of atomic energy readily convertible to destructive purposes are the heart of the difficulty. So long as intrinsically dangerous activities may be carried on by nations, rivalries are inevitable and fears are engendered that place so great a pressure upon a system of international enforcement by police methods that no degree of ingenuity of technical competence could possibly hope to cope with them.

These were the goals set forth by the Majority Plan, and as goals they surely stand. The means chosen to reach these goals proved faulty, particularly when they were rough-hewed by Mr. Baruch. The substantial incentives that were offered to the Kremlin proved insufficient even when the regime was weakest, perhaps because the Kremlin understood that time was on its side.

In four years of negotiations, concessions were made by both sides, new problems were brought into focus, progress was made until, at the end, the margin of difference at the technical level was narrow. The negotiations collapsed because while technical disagreements were narrowing political disagreements were growing wider. As they widened it became increasingly unreal-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

istic to suppose that either side would relinquish to the other its most valued secrets or its most cherished weapons. The incentives offered to the Kremlin to accept the Majority Plan diminished as it developed its own store of secrets and bombs. On the US side Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer noted in 1948:

> There appears to be little doubt that at the present time our unique possession of the facilities and weapons of atomic energy constitutes military advantages which we only reluctantly would lay down.

There was a chance that had the Russians accepted the Majority Plan in 1946 our Congress would have followed suit. By 1951 the Plan was as unacceptable to the Congress and the Pentagon as it was to the Russians. In this sense our adherence to the Plan became hypocrisy, and the Plan itself became a fiction with all the encumbrances that fictions carry in international relations. The remedy surely was not to turn from the Plan's central truths for political considerations, but to create the political climate in which the validity of these truths could be reaffirmed. President Truman rightly reopened the issue of methods of progress while adhering to the basic principle that peace demanded universal and enforceable disarmament. This stand was reasserted by President Eisenhower in his April 16 speech.

What remains of this commitment now? The President, we repeat, has not openly repudiated the past. But the principal contribution of the "new conception" in the minds of experts is that it has finally buried the Majority Plan.

If this is true, is the President right? No one will propose that we should drown, clutching to a life raft that has become waterlogged. Should we then abandon the one life raft we possess to strike out alone, into a darkness where no other life raft can be seen?

The principal author of the Majority Plan, Dr. Oppenheimer, has stated of a world control system: "It is not beyond human ingenuity to invent new proposals." If this is true, *if it is even arguable,* then this is the problem which the United States must face! The way to face it is the way taken by President Truman in 1946. First he called together this country's allies to formulate a common approach in terms of basic principles. Then he assigned a commission of the best and most experienced men available to translate these principles into a plan. President Eisenhower, in contrast, acted alone, presenting his plan to the Premier of France and the Prime Minister of Great Britain in the form of a speech to be delivered two days later. The plan itself was the product, not of scientists, diplomats, military experts and industrialists (as in the case of the Acheson-Lilienthal Report), but of speech writers and experts in psychological warfare. (Its principal author was Mr. C. D. Jackson.)

The Pooling of Fissionable Material

In his speech to the UN the President began with a review of the "dark chamber of horrors." He said: "atomic bombs today are more than 25 times as powerful as the weapons with which the atomic age dawned." These bombs, in turn, he might have added, are triggers for the far more destructive hydrogen bombs. The present US stockpile, the President asserted, is many times "the explosive equivalent of the total of all bombs and all shells that came from every plane and every gun in every theatre of war all through the years of World War II." The President went on to emphasize two facts, terrible for the United States:

> First, the knowledge now possessed by four nations will be eventually shared by others, perhaps all others.
>
> Second, even a vast superiority in numbers of weapons and a consequent capability of devastating retaliation is no preventive, of itself, against the fearful material damage and toll of human lives that would be inflicted by surprise aggression.

With these essential points, the President set the stage for the most drastic proposals. But what followed?

The President proposed that the United Nations create an agency to impound, store and protect fissionable material transferred to it by member nations.

He proposed further that this agency provide this fissionable material as fuel for atomic power plants in areas now starved of power.

Since control is incomparably the more important, it should be considered first.

The "great virtue" of the plan from the control and security viewpoint, the President declares, is that it does not propose to create "a system of inspection and control." This amounts to asserting that the plan solves the control problem by wholly ignoring it.

As the Russian experts pore over this point, they may discern three hints of advance of the problem of control.

First, the interchange of nuclear scientists and engineers for peacetime pursuits will reveal intelligence about each other's weapons.

Second, the UN pool of fissionable material for atomic power plants will exert a "pull" on the national stockpiles of fissionable material set aside for weapons.

Third, if we can co-operate with the Russians on simple tasks, perhaps we can move on, through force of habit, to more difficult problems.

The paranoical Russians are not, of course, unaware of the first point. The second point seems equally illusory. If the US should provide enough fuel for four power plants of 100,000 kilowatts apiece, this would divert 300 pounds of fissionable material which is a tiny fraction of our present annual output. The production of nuclear energy, after all, is the largest industry in the United States, soon to consume 10 percent of all the electricity we produce. Before long we will have a surplus of fissionable material as military needs reach saturation point. To suppose that the diversion of fissionable material to build power plants overseas will seriously eat into our output, let alone our stockpile, is fanciful. No greater "pull" will be exerted on the Kremlin since the ratio of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the production schedules of each nation to its contributions are presumably to be the same.

The third argument, that co-operation may be habit-forming, lacks supporting evidence in the post-war years. Behind it lies the notion that if an American can just talk man-to-man with a Russian, eventually he will see it our way. This assumes that the Russians do not comprehend their own self-interest, that the course taken by the Soviet state is susceptible of alteration through *camaraderie* among a few men and that Russia's self-interest lies in building up the living standards of backward peoples. All three assumptions strike us as highly sentimental. If the Kremlin decides for its own reasons to provide atomic fuel for Pakistan, the fuel will be marked *Courtesy of the Kremlin* and not *Property of the UN.*

If the control problem is to be approached in the spirit of a modest beginning—why not accept the Soviet proposals on control? They are inadequate and illusory, but they offer much more security than is offered by a concentration of fissionable material in a vault marked UN.

The Provision of Atomic Power

The President himself attaches greater importance to the development aspect of his "new conception." By providing nuclear fuel to power-starved areas, "the contributing powers would be dedicating some of their strength to serve the needs rather than the fears of mankind."

This proposal does attempt to meet some present problems—the determination of European nations to build atomic plants; the desire of backward areas, rich in uranium, to make use of the wealth we are taking from them; the impending surplus of fissionable material in the United States, and the desire of the US to remain preeminent in the field of nuclear energy.

Granted all this, does the plan offer a basis for meeting the world's needs and allaying its fears?

The President proposes to provide fuel for atomic power plants to power-hungry areas—fuel they could not otherwise obtain. But fuel is only one element in the cost of atomic power. Equally important is the capital cost. A conventional steam plant costs about $150 to $200 per kilowatt to build; an atomic plant about $300. Larger plants of course are more efficient. But large markets are not characteristic of power-starved areas.

For the nations of Western Europe, atomic power is not economical today. These nations want atomic power because they lack the foreign exchange to import coal and oil. They are already preparing to build atomic plants and to produce atomic fuel, and they will not welcome the suggestion that both fuel and plants be provided under the supervision of an agency which includes Soviet accountants and engineers.

In contrast, the impoverished areas, such as Pakistan and Brazil, where the cost of coal and fuel is so high as to make atomic power worthwhile, lack the capital to build atomic power plants. Nor can we provide these plants in any numbers for the next 10 years. We are just beginning to build our first pilot plant for power. The time required, according to one expert, to build plants overseas is two years of talk and three years of hard work. The end result will be a plant that is nowhere much cheaper than a conventional steam plant.

No one in the Eisenhower Administration is talking of building steam plants and providing coal for the power-starved areas of the world. Is it wiser to talk then of providing them today with plants that can maintain or breed the raw material of atomic devastation? Should we for the sake of minor savings in electricity give to Argentina, Spain or Formosa the material that can touch off a third world war?

A world which has taken from nations the ability to wage atomic war is one in which the benefits of atomic power can be realized. But the world envisioned by the President is one in which significant amounts of fissionable material are held by any number of nations including a revivified Germany and Japan, although these nations retain the power to wage atomic war. The capacity of this world for self destruction is so great as to be almost beyond hope.

For these reasons the President's plan seems to us to be potentially very dangerous. To assert this is not to include that it may not accomplish the President's highest hopes. Its future rests entirely on what the Kremlin chooses to make of it. If for its own reasons unrelated to the plan, the Kremlin decides that it is in its benefit to seek a basis for peace, then the plan may lead to constructive developments. In that case, it will be less a basis than an excuse for serious negotiations. If, as seems more probable, the Kremlin concludes that it will profit the Communist regime to talk of peace, to create the illusion of peace, then it may greet the President's "new conception" with enthusiasm. In this case, the Kremlin will retain intact its power to devastate the free nations while they, supposing that the Eisenhower plan offers some magic, hoped-for security, will falter in the preparedness which peace demands in a world without control.

The enormity of existing stockpiles of atomic weapons, the determination of many nations to produce fissionable material, the growing impetus given day by day to surprise attacks give rise to new tensions which minor offsets and good works will not overcome. They demand boldness and courage, as well as charity and restraint. The President's intentions are splendid. He has, in his concept of a UN authority that would license and fuel the world's atomic power plants, the germ of an idea which though not new could be fruitful as part of a larger plan. The absence of a larger plan is the grave weakness in the President's proposal. Nor is this the President's fault. His confusion is the product of the intellectual poverty created by eight years of secrecy in a nation whose way is found in freedom of debate. The President's "new conception" is neither new nor a conception; but until the President provides the American people with the facts, they will find it hard to prepare a better plan.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is Atomic Power Feasible?

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S "new conception" transfers the emphasis in nuclear energy policy from the control of nuclear weapons to the development of atomic power. The possibilities of controlling them are plainly diminished by any plan to place fissionable material into the hands of many nations. If atomic power is vital for the stability of the non-Communist nations, then the reason for expanding and spreading the supplies of fissionable material, while talking of diminishing them, might be persuasive.

The President apparently assumed that the need for atomic power was great, but made no effort to justify his position. What are the facts?

In the very long term, there is no doubt at all that atomic power may greatly benefit mankind. The cost curve of atomic power, which at present is high, will continue to fall. The cost curve of conventional fuels will rise as the low-cost coal fields and oil wells are exhausted. It has been estimated that only 40 percent of the world's power needs can be met from low-cost conventional sources over the next hundred years.

The immediate situation is far less exciting.

Three types of reactors can be built today to produce atomic power. Their relative efficiency has been estimated in *Nucleonics* for September, 1952, by W. H. Zinn, Director of the Argonne National Laboratory.

The non-regenerative reactor consumes fissionable material and produces only energy. It takes 20 pounds of uranium, costing $700, extracts seven hundredths of one pound of U-235, and with this produces heat equal to 91 tons of coal. From that point on, by the same processes used in a steam plant, the heat produces 18,100 kilowatt hours of electricity at a fuel cost of seven mills per kilowatt hour.

The regenerative reactor captures some of the fragments of the U-235 nucleons separated in the process of fission and uses them to produce plutonium. Using the same amount of uranium, it produces heat equal to 260 tons of coal, and 518,000 kilowatt hours of electricity at a *fuel* cost of 1.3 mills per kilowatt hour.

The breeder reactor increases the total supply of energy available. Starting with the 20 yards of uranium, it produces heat equal to 26,000 tons of coal, and 51,800,000 kilowatt hours of electricity. The cost of its power depends on what disposal is made of the plutonium produced.

The *fuel* cost of coal in comparable steam plants is 2.8 mills. But while the fuel cost of dual-purpose reactors is lower than for steam plants, their capital costs are higher.

For overseas it is assumed that only plants that produce power will be built. On this assumption, Howard Gary of McGraw-Hill has calculated in what areas of the world atomic power plants would be economical today. He concludes that Western Europe, South Africa, most of Eastern India and Southeast Australia can operate cheap steam plants; that hydroelectric resources in Central Africa, parts of Chile, Brazil and Uruguay are ample; that for most of the Far East, coal and oil are sufficient as low-cost fuels today. Natural gas and diesel oil provide cardinal power requirements for most of the Middle East and North Africa, Mexico, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela.

In contrast, atomic power plants, Mr. Gary believes, may be economical in Finland, Afghanistan, Pakistan, the Sudan, French West Africa and the regions of Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Bolivia and Paraguay which are too remote to be served by coal or 25-cent-a-gallon oil. These nations cannot afford the enormously expensive research and development costs that are necessary to produce nuclear fuel. They would be prepared, no doubt, to accept atomic power plants, given assurance of nuclear fuel, and aid in the financing and construction of plants. The benefits they would gain from these plants, however, would be marginal today.

In contrast the nations of Western Europe are pressing forward with atomic energy developments in the belief that one day it will be cheap, and will free them from dependence on direct supplies of domestic coal. Britain is building one breeder reactor at Harwell and plans to build a second. Norway and Holland are collaborating on research which they hope will aid their merchant fleets. Sweden is planning one reactor for 1954; Belgium is planning two; France hopes to have a network of atomic power plants by 1967; Germany has received voltages from Harwell and hopes to benefit from atomic power within 10 years. Together, 12 nations have formed the European Organization for Nuclear Research, which is building a laboratory in Geneva for basic nonsecret research.

Obviously as more and more nations produce atomic power, questions of supervision and control must be raised. It may well be that if the Kremlin rejects the President's proposal, the United States will accept the role of building and fueling atomic power plants for the free world. Regardless of the risks or benefits involved, such a role is prohibited today, under Section 10 of the Atomic Energy Act.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

China Trade—"Bloody" or Wise?

Behind McCarthy's telegram campaign a very real issue is developing.

by Tom Fitzsimmons

McCARTHY ended: "The President is an honorable man. I strongly urge every American who feels as I do about this blood trade with [Red China] to write or wire the President . . . so he will be properly guided in the matter."

During the 14 days that followed more than 50,000 Americans offered guidance. One-half expressed their confidence in the President, the others their trust in McCarthy. Perhaps one in a hundred knew the truth about the issue on which they were taking sides today or are aware of the very real challenge that trade with China will soon create for the Free World.

For the moment Free World's trade with China is very small: Britain's 1952 trade there, for example, amounted to 17 hundredths of one percent of her world trade. It is limited by China's ability to pay for imports and to find exports the Free World wants to buy, as well as by very tight strategic controls.

In 1950, the US declared a total embargo on exports to Red China and urged its allies to do the same. They refused, arguing that they received net economic benefits from this trade and that far from stopping it, they were determined to increase its volume. Our allies did not hesitate, however, to endorse the UN resolution of May, 1951, for an embargo on all "items useful in the production of arms, ammunition and the implements of war."

With very rare exceptions, all the free nations have complied with that resolution. And our expressions of horror at their refusal to go further were somewhat vitiated by the facts that our imports from Red China in both 1951 and 1952 were greater than the imports and exports of each of the nations in the Organization for European Economic Co-operation. True, we exported no goods to Red China. But Europeans have pointed out that we have paid for these imports with a rather valuable international commodity—dollars.

Today most European countries have opened determined drives to increase their China trade. In the first six months of 1953, England exported $8.7 million worth of goods to China and imported $12 million as compared to $12.8 million of exports and $8.3 of imports for the entire 12 months of 1952.

France's exports for the first six months of this year reached three times the value of 1952 exports—$9.6 million to $3.2—and her imports from China have already all but equalled the 1952 figure—$5.2 to $5.5 million.

West Germany, however, has recorded the most phenomenal increase in China trade. In 1947 she had no trade with China; this year she is well on her way to having more than any OEEC nation, including Britain. German exports to China in 1952 were $2.8 million and $13.7 million in the first six months of 1953. German imports from China were $17.5 million in 1952; and $14.7 million in the first six months of 1953.

These figures illustrate the increased competition for China trade. They indicate that the amount involved is still very small. Britain's world trade, for example, amounted to more than $17 billion in 1952, France's came to almost $9 billion, West Germany's to nearly $8 billion. For these nations, it is the potential market that counts.

China is a nation of some 500 million potential consumers, and she has set her heart on industrialization. Russia and the satellites cannot begin to satisfy her requirements for either consumer goods or capital equipment. And many of our allies believe that by entering this market they will not only help their own economies, but also introduce an element of economic interdependence which may exert a political pull away from the Soviet world.

To nations eager for trade, conditions in China seem extremely favorable. Peiping's Five Year plan on which the regime has staked its future has had to be postponed and cut back for lack of equipment and credits promised by Russia. A series of natural disasters has reduced some areas to actual famine. And a host of untrained, inexperienced young officials seem to have made a mess of the productive and distributive system of the country.

Today the Free World sends China dyes, medicines, and a small amount of manufactured goods. It receives eggs, peanuts, vegetable oils, bristles and feathers. Sooner or later any serious effort to expand this trade to the major produce of the manufacturing countries, which China wants; is going to run afoul of the Battle Act of 1951, which provides for the termination of American aid to any nation which exports "strategic" items to the Soviet bloc. The lack of vitality in world trade indicates that this will happen rather sooner than later.

Germany hopes to push her China trade up to $100 million next year and to ship large amounts of sheet steel, rolling mill products and machine tools. Other free nations are thinking along the same lines, above all Japan.

Sheffield & Sherrod Library
EASTERN KENTUCKY STATE COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japan is in a desperate position, and her dilemma may be the catalyst which will bring about a reexamination of the Free World's trade policies. Japan must import food and raw material, and she must pay for these with manufactured goods. Western nations have refused to lower their import barrier against Japan's products until the US adopts a more liberal import policy toward theirs. With her traditional markets in China largely closed, Japan has not been able to sell as much as she buys. Until now something has always turned up to help her close the gap: American aid, the Korean War, Korean reconstruction, off-shore purchases. But now Japan is looking to the mainland. A special survey of China's Five Year Plan by Japan's Economic Counsel Board points out that Japan can contribute swiftly and continuously, the capital goods and industrial equipment needed for that plan in exchange for cheaper raw materials than are now available in the Free World. There has already been a temporary withholding of orders for coal from the US while the "Big Three" iron and steel manufacturers—Yawata, Fuji and Japan Steel Tube—seek to place orders for over half a million tons of coal from China in exchange for galvanized sheet iron.

RECENTLY, an unofficial group of members of the Japanese Diet concluded a barter "trade agreement" in Peiping with the full backing of leading Japanese businessmen. It provides for a substantial quantity of Japanese exports, of which 35 percent are to be goods which are definitely subject to the ban on trade in strategic materials, 25-percent goods not subject to restriction, and 40 percent in doubtful categories. The Chinese have tied the supply of materials most wanted in Japan, such as coking coal and iron ore, to the receipt of goods now on the most restricted section of the proposed Japanese export list.

The Chinese policy, obviously, is to use Japan's industrial need of raw materials and markets as a lever for obtaining currently prohibited supplies. Japan is sorely tempted. And the situation may force our Administration to come to terms with the need to create a positive world-trade policy. If so, the challenge made by McCarthy may become a major struggle in 1954.

Should Japan, or any other US ally, succumb to the Chinese blandishments, the Administration will have to act in accordance with the Battle Act. There is a certain amount of flexibility in that law: the prohibited lists may be changed to meet changing conditions, and except where arms, ammunition and atomic materials are involved, the President may decide not to end aid to a nation violating the Act if, in his opinion, the stoppage "would clearly be detrimental to the security of the US."

But imagine for a moment the ringing denunciations, the cries of "softness" and "blindness" which would emanate from the Senate Chamber, and the appeals boomed through television sets, if the Administration sought to avail itself of either of these provisions to effect a compromise avoiding either the end of American aid to a nation like Japan or the attempt to enforce by coercion a system of strategic controls entirely dependent on co-operation for their effectiveness.

If such a fight does not occur over Japan, it may develop over Indonesia, where rubber rots while people go hungry, or West Germany, or any other of our allies. And in such a fight the Administration will be at an extreme disadvantage if instead of defending a whole cohesive policy, it attempts to justify individual instances of rather frantic compromise with impatient allies. With a world-trade policy to refer to, however, the Administration might well confound the Republican right-wing.

China urgently needs capital goods and industrial equipment. But, because of her limited surplus of exportable goods, the Free World as a whole has far less to gain from such trade than has China. Actually, the economic difficulties of China, and of most of the satellites, gives the Free World a potentially powerful negotiating device. As long as China, for example, remains unyielding and unco-operative on the major issues that divide the world, there is no reason for the free nations to help her out of her difficulties—it could instead provide greater trade opportunities within the alliance itself, and develop "neutral" markets. The motive for supplying China, or any satellite, with what it needs, then, should properly be political and strategic. But this motive is becoming more and more obscured by the immediate economic needs of many nations in the Free World alliance—needs aggravated by trade barriers within the alliance. And as we have seen there is developing a real danger that in the case of China, at least, the free nations will give substantial aid without naming terms, thus throwing away one of the few cards we now hold.

If the card is to be played so as to extract the maximum of reasonableness from China, or any other member of the Communist bloc, it should be played by a single hand. For individual nations in the alliance to break away and make private deals at this time would be fatal. For their part, the Communists are doing all they can to tempt our allies into doing just that; for ours, we are helping the Communists by holding to our antiquated trade barriers and by each show of weakness before the onslaughts of the extremists.

For the answer is just the opposite of that demanded by McCarthy and Knowland—not less trade, but more trade with China, trade directed and applied to create pressure for East-West co-operation and to demonstrate the superiority of the economic system of the Free World.

There would seem to be no way to accomplish this other than continuing to operate the international mechanism through which the Free World has been restricting East-West trade—and it will not operate on coercion—but to modify it so that we can hold out positive propositions of expanded trade to the Communists in return for clear acts of political co-operation. A positive policy of this sort would draw more popular support than the present makeshift program, and would strengthen the Administration in the coming showdown.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What We Want of Our Teachers

The leading interpreter of John Dewey's philosophy of education join's the NR's debate.

by William Heard Kilpatrick

OUR COUNTRY, building on its democratic tradition, has devised an elaborate public-school system as its conscious or institutional effort to provide for the education of our young. As part of this system, colleges of education are intended to prepare teachers and other professional educators for conducting the schools. Of these teachers' colleges, there are typically two ranks: an undergraduate college designed primarily to prepare teachers for the elementary and less often for the secondary schools; and a graduate school designed primarily to prepare secondary school teachers, school administrators, and teachers for the colleges of education, and to conduct research in problems relating to education.

In the discussion here given, attention is restricted to the honest critics, for sad to say certain trouble makers appear also to be fishing in these troubled waters. These honest critics, holding still to the older outlook, fail to take sufficient account of the regard for youthful personality, which a more sensitive democracy is increasingly demanding. And they likewise tend to ignore certain increasingly accepted psychological insights regarding the learning process. These two neglected advances largely explain the development of modern education.

There is no single theory of modern education universally accepted, but it is possible to state a theory which is now widely accepted and seems to be winning out. This winning theory is relatively new and differs essentially from the old theory which was once dominant in Western civilization.

The older theory, with which most people are still most familiar, stresses, almost exclusively, acquiring the content of books. After a long history dating from Alexandria and Rome, this theory was formulated afresh at the Revival of Learning. Dean Colet, who opened the first Revival of Learning school in England, thus stated rather precisely in the preface of a Latin Grammar which he wrote for his school, the newly accepted devotion to scholarly culture: "Lerne gladly this lytel treatise, and commend it dylygently vnto your memoryes. Trustynge of this begynnynge that ye shal procede and grow to parfyt literature and come at last to be gret clarkes" [a contemporary added: "in the Greeke and Lattin tonge"].

William Heard Kilpatrick is professor emeritus of Teachers College, Columbia University.

It is this interest of Colet's in books as such which constitutes the basic essence of the older type education, an interest most strongly held among the literary humanists throughout the Western world. What I. A. Richards said of art in general, the upholders of this position accept specifically for this book outlook: In it "we find the record . . . of the experiences which have seemed worth having to the most sensitive and discriminating of persons." It seems fair to say that these men seek in education what the O.E.D. defines as culture: "The training, development and refining of minds, tastes and manners; the condition of being thus trained and refined; the intellectual side of civilization." Matthew Arnold said it explicitly: "Culture, acquainting ourselves with the best that has been known and said in the world." That such an education when really effected and wisely used has had, and can still have, significant effect in broadening and deepening insight into many of the essential problems of life is readily granted. The question is whether a better balanced theory can be found to do the same thing and more.

THE NEW education is precisely the effort to supply such a better theory. This new criticizes the older outlook both as to its *objective* and as to the *method of teaching* used to effect the objective. It criticizes the *objective* as being at best only part of the full proper aim of education and as too easily taking its devotees off into the ivory tower. It criticizes the *teaching method* of the old as ignoring the increasingly recognized psychological principle that to learn anything—be it idea or attitude or skill—one has to respond that way, and the learning is best achieved in a life situation which calls for this responding. The new further criticizes the old method as disregarding the psychological fact of attendant learnings, which accompany every significant experience and in successive experiences accumulate to form attitudes, conceptions, ideals or standards, as the case may be. Shakespeare gives a good example: "In time we hate that which we often fear. Here *fear* is the direct response, while *hate* is the accumulation of successive responses attendant upon strong dislike. It appears that these cumulative attendant learnings are the most significant of all for the building of character and personality, but they were totally ignored by the older outlook so far as concerned its teaching procedures.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Possibly the strongest single objection to this older humanistic objective of education is that, true to its classic Greek origin, it was designed for a leisured aristocracy, and accordingly viewed books and thinking, and still does, primarily as source of consummatory enjoyment, not as instrumental to the guiding of action in behalf of purposes. We can readily admit, along with the broadening effect named above, the evident consummatory pleasure of good literature as a legitimate aspect of the educated person's life, and we can understand how certain sensitive souls wish to give their life to working with such; but to make this the sole aim of general education comes perilously close to offering it to people generally as the sole aim and content of life.

By contrast with this exclusively literary outlook of the older education, any adequate general education exists primarily, so we must think, to rear the young to the best possible all-round *living*, both individual and social. The school must thus contemplate the *whole* of life and this means that it must expect the growing person eventually to take, in our democratic world, a responsible and discerning part in the *full* life. It would appear then that the only satisfactory over-all or general objective for education is the progressive building of the all-round character to meet all sides and aspects of a proper normal life. As opposed to this modern inclusive objective for education we find an outstanding proponent of the old outlook saying that "if education is rightly understood, it will be understood as the education of the intellect" and elsewhere he explicitly excludes "character building" from his junior college curriculum. Another college man says of his college, what is probably true of too many other colleges, "We concern ourselves not at all . . . in trying to teach our girls to be good. That is the work of the home and of the Sunday school. We devote our efforts solely to making our girls intelligent." He might have added "—intelligent about books."

In comparison with the exclusive emphasis of the old on "the intellect," the new with its regard for "all-round effective character" will of necessity include "the education of the intellect" as a strong part of its program; for, as the Harvard report says, "the whole man is integrated only so far as his life is presided over by his reason." But the intellect or reason cultivated apart from actual life responding is ineffective for building a behaving character. It is thus ineffective "as a means for the mastery of life."

Equally important is the difference between old and new as to the means to be used to attain this immediate objective of all-round character. The old throughout its history has stressed memorizing and the passing of examinations as its main reliance. This is the natural correlative of holding to book content as its exclusive objective. For this older outlook what Plutarch says of memory still holds in great measure: "Nothing doth so beget or nourish learning as memory . . . for this is, as it were, the storehouse of all learning." With this, Dean Colet's emphasis exactly fits, as we saw above. And today any school is living in essential accord with the old tradition in the degree that it thinks of the recitation as a re-citing, and so manages its examinations that skillful "cramming" can certify one as educated.

As opposed to such a limited outlook for education with its inadequate theory of the learning process, the new asserts that learning is more than acquiring words, more even than acquiring ideas. A thing has not really been learned until it *can* and *will* assert itself later in appropriate conduct. Only when the person *can* and *will* behave that way has he really learned that thing, *can* and *will* use that thought or feeling or movement as it is needed in life.

And it may be added that learning what a master mind has said by no means conveys the wisdom included in that statement, by no means does it give to the learner the use which that master mind has of that wisdom. Significant suggestions can come from the words of others, but wisdom must be one's personal accumulation from many successive personal experiences critically studied. And the same holds in much the same way for all generalizations. In general each must make his own generalizations out of his own experiences if his generalizations are to work effectively for him. Specifically, no generalization can be given to another except as that person's own previous experience has fitted him to understand and use what is given to him.

HOW THEN does one *learn,* really learn so that what is learned will truly function appropriately in his life? The answer has been implied. *We learn what we live, and learn each item as we accept it for life's purpose.* We learn anything in the degree we live it, in the degree we count it important, and in the degree that it fits in with what we already know and use. If one such experience does not give strong enough learning, further like experiences will strengthen the learning.

What conception of school results from the foregoing? The answer seems clear. The new school must be a place of, and for, living. The pupils will inevitably learn what they live. If the living is of low quality, then the pupils will build low quality characters. If the living is of high and fine quality, the pupils will build fine quality characters. Now good living will use the content of school subjects; but real living will seldom stay from 9:15 to 9:50 within the confines of arithmetic and at 9:50 shift to geography. Living does not so proceed. The new school guides promising pupil purposes along desirable lines of thought and act; and its pupils thus learn. They learn the content of the old subjects, even better than in the old school; but the new school does not teach subjects as such or by the clock. In other words, the new school is truly a school of living. In educational parlance, the new school is an activity school, where the term activity stresses, under proper teacher guidance, self-direction and creative work in every desirable area that belongs to the age level concerned. The teacher, to be sure, is always in control, but works to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elicit the best, the most creative and most responsible and most intelligent possible living from the pupils; for the pupils *will* learn what they *live* and in the degree *they* live it.

How now in brief does the guiding theory of the new education differ in crucial essence from the old?

The old education is of books, to teach the best that others have said. The new is of life and behaving, to build under wise guidance out of actual experience the all-round character.

The old holds that education is primarily intellectual, to see and grasp and enjoy the best that has been thought and said. The new holds that education must develop the "whole person," that in the process of this development thinking is to be sure the essential and guiding part of the whole, but such thinking exists primarily to direct action in all the necessary and desirable aspects of life.

The old outlook limits school work to acquiring formulated wisdom, trusting mistakenly that from this will come appropriate action. The new holds that each learner must out of his own experience behavior build his own working mind and character.

Because the all-round character at which the modern school aims must be the strict correlative of the all-round life which the person is to live, our next attention will be given to the features of this all-round life.

SEVEN ITEMS will be named at which the school system as a whole must aim: effective common sense dealing with life, family life, citizenship, general human relations, vocation, fine quality of living, a philosophy of life. Underlying the first six of these will be morality and democracy to guide and shape them; the seventh is to help youth see the need and place of morality and democracy.

Common sense dealings come first and underlie all else. Family life and citizenship stand out strongly. The school, taking age levels into account, must educate our young people for responsible family relationship and for general citizenship. Our youth must be made ready and disposed to discharge these duties intelligently and responsibly. And, further, if we believe in equal rights for all, the young people must be made ready, so far as feasible, for richness of living in what they do. They must see and accept more to life than money can buy; they must build ideals of life and work, from which enrichment of life can come. And, finally, while the term philosophy may to many sound too advanced for youth, even those who leave school at the end of high school must have begun to build an inclusive and defensible outlook on life.

Vocational preparation (except of course for the "learned professions") is an innovation still looked at askance by some. But in a democratic society all must expect to work. We must accordingly admit vocational preparation to an essential place, given at various levels in order to fit actual economic need. Many girls who must soon get to work will wish stenography and typewriting in the secondary school, while many boys analogously will wish training in auto-mechanics or printing. At the college level, many girls will wish preparation for teaching, while many boys will wish, say, engineering.

Much of the enrichment of life must be taught through all that is done. What we may call the broader humanities will help. As American citizens our youth must learn to understand and appreciate the history and philosophy of our American republic. As persons who will read newspapers and books and dress and keep house, they must study at least some of the esthetic possibilities of life as they will live it. They must also know and appreciate at least some of our better literature. And further as active citizens in the school community and, desirably, as active citizens in the larger community about their school, they must learn constructive discussion and the ideals of proper citizenship.

Finally, in everything that goes on in and through the school we must always help our pupils and students to build the ideals, attitudes, and habits which promise good and intelligent citizenship, an active and adequate morality, proper human relations of respect and regard for other persons and groups, the enrichment of living, and a sound and healthy philosophy of life.

From all the preceding, these duties of the colleges of education seem to follow directly as they attempt to prepare teachers and others for their school work:

Help each prospective teacher and administrator to build such a philosophy of life as gives a proper working conception of the life at which education is to aim and an intelligent understanding of our civilization along with its lacks and its possibilities as these bear on the attainment of the desirable life.

Help each prospective teacher or administrator to live such a personal life as will build in him or her the character and will to live the desirable life

Help everyone to build such a philosophy of education as will lead to an understanding and acceptance of the most defensible specific educational aims for guiding the young toward the desirable life.

Help everyone to get such an understanding of the growing child nature and of the inclusive educative process as will enable him or her to guide the young along the effective road toward progressive acceptance of the good life as theirs to live, understanding of course that no two people can or should live the same good life.

Beyond the specific preparation of teachers and administrators, the upper colleges of education have also the ever continuing duty of research into truer and more adequate insights into the aims and processes of education.

From the foregoing and other available information the following judgments regarding the present colleges of education seem warranted:

Any implication that the colleges of education are headed in the wrong direction seems unjustified. Their principal critics, it appears, speak partly from ignorance of the theory now increasingly accepted, partly from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commitment to ideas either now outmoded or otherwise unacceptable.

The chief valid criticism of these colleges lies in inadequacies chargeable to the newness of the education they teach. Education, along with thought in general, is in the midst of a deep-reaching revolution. One hundred years or even two hundred years is too short a time within which to reconstruct a system strongly entrenched for two thousand years. As matters stand the new is most thoroughly accepted by the elementary school, less so by the secondary school, and least by the liberal arts college.

The chief present weakness of the teachers college is the compounding of specialization with the newness of the conception as stated above. Too few working in these colleges have personally acquired the full preparation laid down above for the colleges of education. Their specialization has stood in the way. To be sure, this narrowness holds in greater or lesser degree also for most university professors and most professional men; but the resulting hurtful effect on teachers cannot be denied.

While, of the educated critics, the literary humanists have been most vocal, and while their complaints deserve consideration, it seems impossible to grant their position as they state it. Their advocated educational program, ignoring as it does the fact that pertinent behaving is necessary to adequate learning, leaves character building largely to chance. Also their program, ignoring as it does child nature and the principle of concomitant learnings, easily and often builds contrary and hurtful attitudes. Bernard Shaw recognized this danger when on being asked to have his plays adapted for school use, he replied: "No, I lay my eternal curse on whomsoever shall now, or at any time hereafter, make school books of my work, and make me hated, as Shakespeare is hated. My plays were not designed as instruments of torture." Perhaps the most fundamental error of this humanist group is to be satisfied with an education which leads primarily to discriminating enjoyment rather than builds an all-round effective character. This theory perhaps suited the upper class of ancient Greece; it does not suit modern America.

In this last named regard, the college of education agrees rather with Huxley than with John Cowper Powys: with Huxley, that "the great end of life is action, not knowledge"; rather than with Powys, that "contemplation, not activity of any sort, is the purpose of the universe." Pertinently to this, Hogben says: "The pitiable predilection of the rising generation for action without thought is the legitimate off-spring of thought divorced from action." A graduate of a woman's college currently criticizes her liberal arts education: "College prepared me to be another female college professor." Irwin Edman thus criticizes a certain pursuit of culture: "Culture, in one of its senses, is a combination of elegance and nostalgia, of preciousness and disdain. In this sense, it is an elegant escape into beautiful anachronisms." Howard Mumford Jones speaks strongly in connection: "Unless learning is socially relevant, learning is and remains antiquarian." And he goes on to say that "in the next decade or two learned men are going in all humility to the social scientist and the scientist to discover when humanistic love is truly relevant to the human scene and when it is merely a complicated amusement like chess-playing and genealogy." In one word, the college of education demands that all done in all schools be "truly relevant to the human scene."

A Sharp Tongue, a Hot Temper and a Tender Heart

A recollection of Harold L. Ickes.

by Paul H. Douglas

In February, 1933, just after my friend Harold L. Ickes, had been offered by Roosevelt the appointment of Secretary of the Interior, I suggested to him that he should keep a weekly diary of events. I had just finished reading Gideon Welles' Diary, which seemed to me the best inside account of the happenings within Lincoln's Cabinet. I told him about this, and pointed out that he was likely to take part in equally stirring times, and that in the interests of history, he should do likewise. He agreed. As we met from time to time during the next two decades, he would refer occasionally to the fact that he was following my advice. It is therefore with peculiar emotions that I have read the first published volumes of these diaries, edited with honesty and discretion by his wife, which brings the story down to the end of 1936.

The diary, as published, is typical of Ickes. Here are pungent and brutally frank descriptions of what was happening inside Roosevelt's Administration, as seen through the eyes of a pugnaciously honest man, whose suspicions and tongue, like that of Welles, were equally sharp. Ickes was no respector of persons, and he was in

During the 20s and 30s Senator Douglas fought side by side with the late Harold Ickes to prevent profiteering by the private utilities and to block party bosses from control of local government in Illinois.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

addition something of a feudist. Therefore the Diaries are full of caustic comment about the men with whom he clashed. His old friend, Donald Richberg, who had broken with him on his appointment, is treated roughly, as are Harry Hopkins and Henry Wallace. Interestingly enough, Jim Farley, Vice-President Garner, Cordell Hull and Frank Walker come off with honors. While the treatment of Roosevelt is in no sense idolatrous and Ickes is at times very critical of him, the general impression which is left is one of sympathy and admiration. There is sympathy for a man who, while overburdened with the troubles of state, had to contend with so many cantankerous prima donnas contending for power and influence. There is also admiration for the bravery and buoyancy with which Roosevelt faced so many vexing difficulties.

But while Ickes fought with all who got in his way, he was ferociously honest in the conduct of his work. He was probably the best Secretary of the Interior the country has ever had. Although he had little previous experience in business or in public administration, he turned out to be an amazingly effective executive. Responsibilities were heaped upon him, such as the administration of the public-works program and the oil industry. He carried them all off with high credit. He worked prodigious hours, was always ready to make decisions, and was right most of the time. No breath of scandal touched his work, and huge sums of money passed through his hands without taint or waste. In his zeal to prevent dishonesty, he installed Lewis R. Glavis, who had started the Pinchot-Ballinger row in 1911, as his inspector-general. Glavis, however, instituted such an unreasonable reign of terror that Ickes, after defending him for months, was glad to let him go in 1935. His experience with Glavis made Ickes restudy the Ballinger episode, and a decade later to write an article rehabilitating the reputation of that official.

LIKE A TRUE follower of Theodore Roosevelt, Ickes was an ardent conservationist. He worked to check erosion, and the over-cropping of the public lands by the grazing interests. He believed in checking floods on the great rivers of the West by the construction of dams, which, as a by-product, would generate power and also provide recreation in the lakes which were thus created. He fought the excessive cutting of timber on mountain slopes which could only result in the washing away of the soil in the lowlands, as well as in the hills. He sought indeed to make the Department of the Interior a department of conservation and of public works—a thoroughly logical conception, which it would be well for the present heads of that department to follow.

During the concluding pages of the diary, one notes the growing rivalry between Ickes and Harry Hopkins. This conflict was perhaps inevitable. Hopkins was primarily concerned with relief; Ickes with public works. Ickes wanted substantial projects which would have great worth and be honestly and economically constructed. Hopkins wanted to save families from starvation and idleness. It took time to prepare the plans for Ickes' public works. His fear of graft and his desire for local participation slowed up construction still further. Moreover, the projects themselves required primarily skilled workmen who, because of their past earnings, were generally not in a desperate condition. The beneficial effect upon those in great need was therefore at best secondary and indirect. But these were the very people with whom Hopkins as administrator of relief was necessarily concerned. He wanted not only to feed these men and women, but also to give them something useful to do so that they might develop their skills and acquire far greater self-respect. In the process, Hopkins wanted to get as useful community amenities as possible out of what would otherwise have been wasted time. Hopkins therefore wanted to go directly to the target and to give work to those who were on relief. In order to stretch the limited funds as far as possible, he therefore developed projects which had a high labor content in each dollar. While many of these were hastily planned, the vast majority were excellent. It is indeed a pity that the American public had been allowed to forget the many fine pieces of work completed under the WPA.

The truth is that both types of projects are needed to help offset a severe depression, and that both should be planned in advance. Public works can be carried out alongside the payment of unemployment insurance. But projects of an improved WPA type can be used for those who have exhausted their claims for benefits and who are in need. Had all this been realized at the time, perhaps there would have been less bitterness and less jockeying for position within the circle of Roosevelt's advisors.

As the campaign of 1936 approaches, one can sense Ickes impatience to get into the fight. He lashes out at Al Smith and the Liberty League. He goes after William Randolph Hearst, who had promoted Governor Landon's nomination by the Republicans. He makes war on Colonel McCormick and the other lords of the press who were opposing Roosevelt. It was on these occasions, one gathers, that Ickes really enjoyed himself. For he loved nothing better than taking on the powerful in behalf of the poor and the weak.

This indeed gives the clue to Ickes' character. Underneath the sharp tongue and the hot temper was a tender heart. Ickes really cared for the people who were having a hard time. He felt that it was his duty to fight for them and against those whom he thought were abusing their power. He was, in fact, a prickly knight-errant with one of the lowest boiling points of any man in public life since the days of Andrew Jackson.

In editing her husband's diaries, Mrs. Ickes has abridged but not altered them. She has left out many painful personal references to those who are now living. In 20 to 30 years, the historians will go through the text of these diaries, and dredge up to sight some of these suppressed comments. They will make spicy reading but so does this volume. This is not only the stuff out of which history is written; it is in fact history itself.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GERALD W. JOHNSON: *The Superficial Aspect*

TO A POLITICAL non-expert, a mere statistic in the election returns controlling one vote only, and in possession of none but outside information, it seems as plain as anything can be that in 1952 General Eisenhower's one measurable asset was popularity and that the Republican Party's one measurable asset was Eisenhower.

The campaign was not fought on any specific program of legislation offered by the party, nor on any specific political philosophy offered by the candidate. The consideration that turned the scale was summed up in three words: "I like Ike." This is demonstrated by the fact that while Eisenhower was winning a majority of six and a half million, his party barely squeaked through in Congress. Indeed, the Democratic candidates for Congress actually polled more popular votes than the Republican candidates.

To a simple-minded bystander it would seem, then, that conservation and accretion of this stock of good-will should have been the first care of both the party and the President. As one looks back on it, the position of the new President was really amazing; not since the Era of Good Feeling in the second Administration of James Monroe had formal, determined opposition been so completely erased.

In January, 1953, President Eisenhower actually had the Democratic Party under his command. Let us not forget that after the November catastrophe the opposition decided to swallow its chagrin and do the handsome thing. President Truman invited the President-elect to the White House and in an interview without witnesses told him all those dangerous facts that could not be discussed publicly. At Mr. Truman's order, subordinate officials called in their successors-to-be and offered them all information and assistance necessary to a smooth and orderly transfer of power.

Even in Congress during the first session a majority of Democrats voting in one house or the other at one time or another supported the President's proposals not once but nearly 60 times. Repeatedly their support enabled him to beat off attacks by members of his own party. In short, there was no appreciable partisan opposition. Politically, it was an ideal situation worth preserving at almost any cost.

But that is, of course, the opinion of a rank outsider observing Washington from across the District line. It is not the opinion that prevailed in the capital, if one may judge by events. The President permitted his Attorney General to make a speech insulting Mr. Truman by questioning his loyalty; which put a sudden and permanent stop to any further courtesies from Mr. Truman. The President himself chose to characterize the Democrats' program of public welfare as "creeping socialism" which puts a stop to any further support by Democrats in Congress. The Era of Good Feeling is over.

Rebuffing the opposition is good strategy, however, if it serves to consolidate one's own party. But the Republican Party at this moment is about as solid as the French Chamber of Deputies, in which it is every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost. Right after the nomination Mr. Eisenhower chilled the enthusiasm of liberal Republicans by striking hands with Taft; and the death of Taft has chilled the enthusiasm of Taftites, who never liked the alliance anyhow.

Even the official family seems not to like Ike very much. Brownell opened the way for McCarthy's frontal assault. Benson has set the farmers aflame, and McKay the conservationists. Weeks outraged the scientists with the Astin affair. Wilson has the Pentagon snarling and has frozen the hopes of small industrialists. Even below Cabinet rank Talbott made that dreadful break about putting atomic weapons in Spain, and Hall, the Republican National Chairman, issued a statement giving aid and comfort to McCarthy. Dulles is loyal enough, but has all he can do to save his own hide from the isolationists. Far from receiving assistance from them, the President is having to work overtime to repair the damage done by his closest associates.

Superficially, at least, it would seem that the good-will so conspicuous 13 months ago has been dissipated recklessly. Apparently nobody in the Administration appreciated its value, or even believed in its existence; the new regime seems committed to the theory that it is not enough to be liked, it is necessary to be feared.

Maybe it is good politics to waste no time proving that you are right, but to spend all your energies trying to show that your opponent is not only wrong, but scoundrelly. Maybe—but the superficial aspect of it is childish.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LITERATURE AND THE ARTS

CATHOLIC IRELAND ARRAIGNED

by Padraic Colum

The Irish and Catholic Power is not a discerning book, although it is evident that the writer has made an effort to give a fair summary of Irish history and to set down pros and cons in particular cases. But Paul Blanshard is committed to an orthodoxy that is counter to the orthodoxy he criticizes. His is one that has been dominant in parts of Europe, particularly in France, and influential in the United States where it is much less narrow. It is an orthodoxy that in politics is secularist, in philosophy positivist, in action anti-clerical. Paul Blanshard summarizes it as democracy. That one might be an ardent democrat and be neither a secularist nor a positivist, he has no means of knowing. That a democracy might not only tolerate, but, for its own protection against authoritarianism, desire, diversity in systems of public instruction, would be regarded by him as a blasphemy. But when that has been said anyone who knows present-day Ireland has to go on to say that the instances he gives of clerical interference in social and political life are incontrovertible, and, by any standards, anti-democratic.

THE IRISH AND CATHOLIC POWER, by Paul Blanshard (Beacon; $3.50).

Ireland is a country that has suffered so many and such various misfortunes that it is no wonder that a distinguished Irish soldier in the service of France wrote to Dean Swift that a people have only to accumulate misfortunes to have those whom they have taken refuge amongst come to believe that, somehow, they deserved them. The Chevalier Wogan wrote at a time before supplementary misfortunes came on the Irish people. Among these was the way in which Catholicism was restored in Ireland.

Wogan, one of Europe's remarkable men of action, had seen his co-religionists outlawed, their properties confiscated, their schools closed, their churches handed over to another communion, and the fronts they had most pride in, lineage and learning, breached. There could be, those who were casting the new Protestant state of England and Scotland realized, no national resurgence if the Catholic Irish were deprived of leadership: there could be no leadership if the properties of the leading Catholic families were confiscated, their schools closed, and penalties imposed on them for sending their children abroad for an education. It was one of the few projects in history that had almost complete success.

There followed the Irish dispersal into France, Spain and the Empire. Spain, with a generosity the Irish people have never forgotten, gave them the beautiful College of the Irish Nobles in Salamanca; France, in return for the thousands of Irish soldiers that stiffened her ranks, let them have a College in Paris; in the Spanish Netherlands, in Louvain, Irish scholars gave and received instruction. It is roughly true to say that in the bitter century that followed the revocation of the Limerick Articles of Agreement the Catholic Church safeguarded the elements that were to form an Irish nationality. It gave Ireland a window into Europe. It offered another ideal beside that of the English hegemony which the Scotch and the Welsh were to accept. And the tradition of priests carrying on their office in a churchless Ireland at the risk of imprisonment or death has been in the lore of the people for two hundred years.

The re-establishment of Catholicism in Ireland, of Catholicism as an institution, came mainly from Paris. This was not fortunate, for Jansenism and counter-Reformation Catholicism surrounded the Irish students in Paris at the time. The defensiveness of a church dominated by Protestantism had a sour note added to it by the new clergy. For a while a certain mellowness was supplied by the priests from Salamanca. But, as these became fewer and fewer and the priests from the newly founded and French-influenced seminary of Maynooth took over, this mellowness faded out. Take that exuberant, bawdy eighteenth century poem, "The Midnight Court" (Paul Blanshard quotes from it in Frank O'Connor's translation, the Gaelic original of which cannot be bought openly in Dublin), as an example of the hearty pre-Maynooth Catholicism. A County Council refused to put up a monument to its author in the churchyard in which he is buried. "The priests whom the grandfathers of these Councillors knew would have split their sides laughing at the bawdy passages involving the clergy" an Irish historian said to me. The re-established Catholicism—and this was a supplementary misfortune—was puritanical. To add to the unfortunate situation the priest was the only person of status in Catholic communities and the bishop was the only great native official. All this made for the assumption of privilege on the part of the clergy, its acceptance on the part of the people, and that, with more and more interference in social life.

Here is a local instance. I quote from a booklet in which an old newspaperman in County Cork recalls characters he knew. One was the dancing master. Sometimes there were complaints from parents about the lack of decorum in gatherings he attended. "After this contumacious dancing-master had been severely castigated, and his unblest academy denounced as a moral plague-spot in the parish, the congregation was exhorted in no uncertain terms to give the eviction of 'Mr. Fiddlesticks' their immediate and urgent attention." The writer adds regretfully, "the passing of the old-time dancing-master has, in its own small way, helped to accelerate the flight from the land which is such a regrettable feature of modern Irish life." The turning of "Mr. Fiddlesticks" away from the possibility of making a living does not seem to have concerned his denouncer, and one is forced to ask if behind his dismissal there was not jealousy of another kind of influence. In Brittany at the time every chapel would have had its dancing-master officiating before the chapel-yard with the priest exchanging quips with him.

This is a long way round to a review of a book whose center is the present-day Irish Republic. But unless one understands why Irish Catholicism is defensive, puritanical and authoritative, and at the same time, so much a part

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the lives of the Irish people, one cannot assess *The Irish and Catholic Power*. The situation is bad for Ireland and bad for Catholicism in Ireland. The continued interference of priests and bishops in social and political affairs is an argument for the isolation of the Protestant Northeast. A group that regards itself as privileged has no means of meeting a challenge, and unless they are able to meet challenges that are bound to be offered, the Irish hierarchy will lose its legitimate influence.

Paul Blanshard is well able to illustrate his thesis that Irish Catholicism—as represented by the bishops, anyway—is anti-democratic. There was the Mother and Child Scheme initiated by the Minister of Health in the Costello cabinet in 1951. The bishops had a right to advise the government about it—no one denied that. They did not advise; they commanded the government to drop the bill. The government did. Not only that—they apologized for having brought it in. And the leader of the opposition stood silently aside, making no protest against this anti-democratic procedure. It seemed as if the people of the Republic took for granted that a veto on the procedure of their national assembly was in order.

Also there was the episode, not referred to by Paul Blanshard, the episode around Douglas Hyde's lying in state in St. Patrick's Cathedral. Douglas Hyde was a great Protestant Irishman who devoted his life to the revival of the Irish language and the collecting of Irish folklore; that Irish has currency today is largely due to his efforts. No one in Ireland was more beloved than "An Craoibhin Aoibhin," and no one had served Ireland more disinterestedly. The Free State honored itself by making him President. But an Irish Ministry absented itself from the cathedral where he was lying in state. St. Patrick's was a Protestant church and no Catholic, not even in a public capacity doing homage to the head of the national government, might enter it. This was as disgraceful as it was impolitic.

But while there is much in the book that any thoughtful person of Irish birth will go along with, there is also much that is written with the old Protestant bias that such a person is bound to react against. The belief that Irish Catholicism is incapable of being either modern or democratic is constantly peeping from under his carefully delivered testimony. Speaking of the border between the Republic and the Six Counties he says, "It is a Protestant-Catholic border; it is a British-Irish border; it is a border in time between the democratic state and the medieval spirit of Rome." Does Paul Blanshard really believe that the town of Dundalk on one side of the border and the town of Newry on the other are really different? Is Belfast more modern than Dublin or only more nineteenth century? Is Lord Brookborough more democratic in action and intention than Mr. de Valera? Is the northern area with its gerrymandered elections and its acceptance of landlordism more democratic than the Republic? And can one discuss modern intellectual questions more freely in Belfast than in Dublin? He takes it for granted that it was the British who wrote religious freedom into the Treaty that set up the Irish state. "Perhaps if they [Irish Catholics] had won their independence in a full-dress civil war, Protestantism would have been ruthlessly suppressed." What right has Paul Blanshard to make such an assumption? I know that before the plenipotentiaries were accredited by Dail Eireann there were conferences between Arthur Griffith and the leaders of the minority party headed by Lord Middleton. At these conferences safeguards for religious liberty were arranged and put into the draft treaty. Knowing this I am made indignant by this sort of thing: "As it was, when the British Government finally decided to yield to Irish guerrilla warfare and world liberal opinion, it took the precaution of writing certain guarantees of continuing religious liberty into the law."

The over-all picture he gives of the Irish Republic today is far less inspiriting than it need be. The population is static, but it is not declining. There is much stir in the country and important results are being achieved. It is doubtful if any other small country in Europe has done more to provide good housing for the people than the Free State and the Republic; the new factories that are going up are modern and hygenic; recent architecture has struck many outside observers as being remarkably good. Paul Blanshard writes about the effort to make modern Ireland a bilingual country as farcical ("the Green Elephant"). But Irish is being spoken and written to an increasing degree. When such a writer as Liam O'Flaherty turns from English to Irish it means that he is sure of a public for his stories. Against the instances of episcopal interference that he gives should be placed the historical fact that in issues involving a national claim the bishops have always had to withdraw. When the National University was being founded the bishops opposed the demand that Irish be made an essential subject for entrance; they wanted a University that would be open to Catholic students from America and the British Dominions. The Bishops lost out on that issue. In the case of the Mother and Child Scheme the issue was confused. The people distrusted a measure that seemed to take from the autonomy of the family. But when the government went to the country, the promoter of the bill was elected with an increased vote. The action of the bishops was intolerably high-handed and the attitude of the government deplorably weak. But the social and political pronouncements of the bishops are not regarded as sacrosanct by an Irish Catholic public.

SEARCH FOR EMPIRE

THIS BOOK presents in an exceedingly usable and informative edition one of the great American classics. To those who love the wide expanses of the plains and mountains, and the adventure which they offer, the *Journals* of Lewis and Clark will always head the list of American literature. They also contain rich deposits of scientific data pertaining to

THE JOURNALS OF LEWIS AND CLARK, by Bernard DeVoto (Houghton Mifflin; $6.50).

flora and fauna and observations on Indian folk-ways and primitive psychology, not yet fully appreciated nor explored. To the student they offer one of the most exciting chapters in American history.

When Jefferson conceived of the project, the country to the west of St. Louis and east of the Rocky Mountains was Spanish. When he persuaded Congress to appropriate $2500 for financing the expedition that country was French. When the expedition started up the Missouri the country had been acquired by the United States. In its conception therefore it involved an unwelcome traverse across a wide stretch of foreign soil. But there was the Oregon country beyond the Rockies to which we already had legitimate claim. The British were pressing their lines of fur trade south

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and west from Canadian posts. The Mississippi Valley was filled with insecurity and even occasionally swept by a separatist movement. The search for the Northwest Passage which Columbus had started was still in progress. These were all part of the complex of forces helping Jefferson shape his plans for consolidating the position of the United States on this continent.

Meriwether Lewis and William Clark were his agents in charge of the expedition. No expedition has been better managed; none ever had a higher morale; none ever wrote a more commendable record. The obstacles were enormous—unknown geography, hostile Indians, treacherous waterways, a food supply that was largely dependent on hunting and fishing, unexplored mountain ranges to cross and a limited time for the crossing, meagre medical and surgical supplies. Once the party left St. Louis, headed West via the Missouri River, it was wholly on its own. No more supplies of ammunition, clothing, or food to be furnished; no expeditionary force to relieve them in case of trouble; nothing but their wits, their physical endurance, their courage, their spiritual power to sustain them.

The chronicles they have left show an amazing coolness in judgment, calmness in crises, skill in diplomacy, expertness in geography, ability to survive. These are shown in part by the skill in averting tragedies, the absence of indiscretions, the complete devotion of the entire group to the cause. They are also shown in part by the management of crises, their genius in geography that only men born to the mountains can fully appreciate, their insight into Indian psychology, their respect for the dignity of every man they met.

These *Journals* will be read and reread as long as America exists. They are as exciting as the frontier itself. Their English is often at the grammar school level. But they contain phrases that are literary gems and shafts of insight that are thrilling. They reveal the many aspects of the true American character—adventure, courage, self-reliance, initiative, tolerance, and a great capacity for friendship. One who walks with Lewis and Clark on their long trek to Astoria, Oregon and back to St. Louis will have tremendous pride in the American character. And if he is kin to the outdoors he will believe theirs was the greatest adventure of all.

When I started my book *Of Men and Mounatins* my first research was in these *Journals*. I had the fourteen volume Thwaites edition. As I read this new volume of DeVoto's I kept thinking how wonderful it would have been if I had had it at that time. The meat—the essential substance of these fourteen volumes—is in this single book. It could have been in my brief case and usable in a plane as well as in a library. In addition, DeVoto has distinct contributions of his own. A preface gives the historical setting of the expedition and information about the leaders. An index makes every place and incident readily located. Six maps give the picture of the two-year trek in graphic form. DeVoto's footnotes give a new mine of information: definitions of unusual words, historical and geographical references, explanations of obscure passages, and notes that tie the story together. DeVoto also adds (in a different type) headnotes or parenthetical summaries of his own which may explain a hiatus in the text or summarize episodes which are not sufficiently important to include in diary form.

This is an excellent job of editing. De Voto brings to the task not only more book learning than any other student of the subject. He has firsthand acquaintance with the terrain. On my own travels I have looked up many segments of the Lewis and Clark trail. Every time I learned that DeVoto had been there ahead of me. He is full of his subject and our foremost authority. He has made a unique contribution. Thousands can and will read his volume where only dozens read Biddle, Coues, and Thwaites. WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

A JESUIT IN CHINA

IT'S NOT often that a classic, previously unknown to the world at large, appears on the book market. The only other example I can think of nowadays is the publication of the Boswell manuscripts. Matteo Ricci was of course a much greater man and occupied a much more important place in history, and was at least as interesting a writer. I am inclined to agree with the publishers that this is one of the most important books they have ever issued.

CHINA IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY: *The Journals of Matthew Ricci*, translated by Louis J. Gallagher (Random House; $7.50).

It would seem that relations between the West and China have deteriorated from the beginning. The best sinologists were the early Jesuits, and their Latin translations of the Chinese classics are still at least the equal of anything produced in the succeeding 300 years. They completely merged themselves with the Chinese; in fact they became Chinese literati, with considerable personal influence on the Emperor. They introduced Western science and philosophy to the Orient and Chinese culture to the Occident with such success that the eighteenth century was the century of chinoiserie. Even the Chinese Communists still respect Ricci as the greatest and least predatory of the culture-bearers from the West.

When the Pope ordered the Jesuits to abandon their efforts to adapt Christianity to Chinese culture and to present Roman Catholicism in strictly Western European terms, the Chinese Emperor was aghast at the folly of his Western cousin. As Toynbee says, at this point Christianity had a chance to become a true world religion and rejected it. Never again in history has that opportunity presented itself on such favorable terms. Had Ricci and his colleagues been permitted to continue on their way, there is certainly no question but that the history of the world would have been far different.

Most educated people have heard of this extraordinary adventure in cultural contact at second or third hand. But here it all is for the first time in English, and in the words of Ricci himself—the story of the translation of Euclid into Chinese, the introduction of scientific, astronomical instruments, the first maps with some relation to reality, the first globe, numerous devices and methods of Western mechanics and medicine, and, conversely, the beginning of the translation of the Chinese classics into Latin.

The wonderful thing about this is that there is no question that Ricci and his colleagues were genuinely disinterested; in no sense were they agents of imperialism. If they were never called upon to endure the spectacular martyrdom suffered by Father Jogues and the other members of their Society at the hands of the Iroquois, they were no less brave, no less devoted to the selfless propagation of what they believed to be in most, but not all, ways a superior civilization, as well as the only sure salvation. Inserted into the narrative as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a sort of dividend is the story of the journey of Brother Bento and two companions overland from India to China, establishing the identity of China and the Cathay of Marco Polo.

The ending is one of the saddest things I have ever read—the death from sheer weariness and overwork of Matteo Ricci, a true universal man, as multifarious in his abilities and interests as Leonardo, but, unlike Leonardo, one whose projects were highly practical and usually completed, and who labored on the cultural frontier of two civilizations.

KENNETH REXROTH

BOOKS ON MUSIC

ASIDE from a routine biographical part, Arthur Berger's *Aaron Copland* (Oxford; $3.50) is essentially an explanation of and an apologia for Copland's work as a composer. It is Berger's opinion that "Copland's position among the composers of our century is a lofty one." An author arguing this point is plagued, at the outset, by the fact that the most-performed and best-known of Copland's pieces, such as *Rodeo* and *Appalachian Spring*, are not only charming and folksy, but conventional and rather frivolous as well. Berger wisely pins his argument to the more severe works—the Piano Variations, the Short Symphony (more familiar as the Piano Sextet) and the Piano Quartet—and shows that these works, composed in the grander manner, have an almost seminal relationship to the lighter pieces. And any listener can testify that, in spite of an obvious eclecticism in point of melodic materials, there are formal, harmonic and rhythmic elements common to all of Copland's music.

The source of Copland's strength, however, is not altogether in his composition. Copland is also a teacher, a critic, a conductor and an impressario of sorts—in spite of the fact that he does not hold an academic post, write for a periodical, lead an orchestra or manage a performing group in any constant or regular way. He doesn't write much music either, being, as Berger says, a one-work-a-year-man. As an influence on music, here and now, Copland is unique. Mr. Berger's evaluation of that influence may well prove, with time, to be too generous, but Copland is himself a generous man, and Mr. Berger's kind words are carefully chosen.

Herbert Weinstock's *Music as an Art* (Harcourt, Brace; $6.50) might well be taken as an antidote to Paul Henry Lang's monumental but occasionally galling *Music in Western Civilization*. Weinstock has contrived a history of Western music which is thorough, dignified, without an excess of sociological speculation, and suitable for anybody who can read music; any music history, of course, carries this condition with it.

In his introduction, Mr. Weinstock says that he learns from music—equally from music that he enjoys and that he does not—that it is "a symbolic, immediate, and untranslatable presentation to our comprehension and response," able "to dispense with portrayal, depiction, and exegisis, to strike directly at the mind and heart by symbolic articulation." With this as his hypothesis, Weinstock seems to be able to extract some meaning from all of the prominent styles of composition since the Gregorian period. He has the catholic taste of the orthodox sophisticated listener, with no strong antipathies and no overwhelming enthusiasms. To a biased listener, such as myself, he tends to underrate music before Monteverde and overrate the eccentricities of certain mannered moderns, notably the arch-conservative Stravinsky, who, according to Weinstock, "has journeyed as far as seems possible within the borders of tonality."

Weinstock devotes almost forty pages of his book to music before 1600 and a little less to music since *Petrouchka*. The better—and bigger—part of his book treats of the music, (and not the personalities) in between. As such, it gives an accurate account of what happened, when, where and why.

Boris Goldovsky has collected some of his radio talks—from the intermissions of the Metropolitan Opera broadcasts—into a book called *Accents on Opera* (Farrar, Straus and Young; $4), Mary Ellis Peltz has supplied additional information. Needless to say, everything in the book is old stuff, accurate but not very perceptive, and written in a disagreeably patronizing tone.

Maria Leiper and Henry W. Simon have collected *A Treasury of Hymns* (Simon and Schuster; $6), and the result of their labors is surely the fanciest Protestant hymn book you could hope to see. The collection is enormous, and contains everything from "Jesu, Joy of Man's Desiring" to "Throw out the Life-Line." The editors have added notes and comments on each of the hymns.

ROBERT EVETT

EVERYMAN'S MUSEUM

WHEN André Malraux created that institution now known as a *museum without walls*, he performed a generous service for the publication of the art book with its photographs in black and white and in color. The art book has become a small gallery of art to be held in hands. And publications of Skira, of Pantheon, and of Abrams, have distinguished the market with well-made art books.

Now the problem for the individual collector of art books is nearly as difficult as the problem for the trustees and directors of museums—one is not faced with a scarcity of works of art nor in works of art in reproductions. Instead each one is faced with too small a budget for acquisitions. Of course, museums with walls always add to their collections with gifts and bequests—their officers "work" hard on this part of their fiscal policy. And after all, at this Christmas Season, a similar policy for the collector of art books would be in order and necessary.

Both *Byzantine Painting* by André Grabar (Skira; $20) and *Modern Painting* by Maurice Raynal (Skira; $25), two of the finest publications this season, are art books that must be obtained either by bequest, or by purchase, or even by a long term loan (stopping just this side of theft) from some unsuspecting friend. *Modern Painting* does not

"A huge Vanity Fair of Connecticut suburbia."—John Chamberlain
JEROME WEIDMAN'S
THE THIRD ANGEL
"Jerome Weidman has here written his finest novel."—Boston Herald
$3.95 at all booksellers
DOUBLEDAY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duplicate the definitive three volumes previously published by Skira on modern art, because this Raynal volume presents in an unique and excellent manner, by chronological order, the important works of the master and minor artists set in the context of their age and with their peers, from Seurat to date. To see these reproductions so arranged and to read M. Raynal's scholarly and critical evaluations is indeed to walk leisurely among the European and American paintings of the past sixty years. And although the most important works of the familiar modern artists are not always on exhibit, one has, despite the exhilaration, an almost frightening conviction that this "modern" period already belongs to history, for it would seem to be an entity—would seem to have its beginning (with Seurat and Cézanne), its middle (with Gris and Braque) and its end (with the Constructivists).

With the same sense of history we are given a Byzantium that would have delighted Yeats—these paintings, mosaics and frescoes collected by Professor Grabar, who has reaped from that magnificent cultural epoch a most exciting exhibition of works of art, which by their aesthetic and for their intended purpose were highly restricted: the Icons to be sacred must, like the Scriptures, remain unchanged so as to remain sacred. Thus the Byzantine painters and draftsmen and mosaic-masons were forced, while obeying these very restrictions, into such an individual use of line and color and texture that they burst forth from the confines of a dictated organization and an unchangeable image to create some of the most magnificent of Western art.

The color reproductions in these two large Skira volumes, though not exactly equal to the originals I have seen, are nonetheless of such similitude that they "seem" to be right—as right as photography can capture color without its texture. The same can be said for the four small Skira volumes—($4.95 each)—*Gauguin* by Charles Estienne, *Picasso* by Maurice Raynal, *Van Gogh* by Charles Estienne and C. H. Sibert; and *Lautrec* by Jacques Lassaigne. These books are delightful though small (6½" x 7½") with excellent texts, and are so priced as to fall within the acquisition fund of the gentle reader who is to become his own director of a *museum without walls*. Still, the question remains whether for reasons of economy it is possible to reduce the size of a reproduction and the size of critical scope without minimizing the effect of the whole—the art book itself. The *Picasso* is fine, but the *Gauguin* is the best of these first four publications in "The Taste of Our Times" apparently because M. Estienne celebrates the fiftieth year of the death of this symbolic painter.

Creative Intuition in Art and Poetry by Jacques Maritain (Bollingen Series: Pantheon; $6.50) has surely the finest philosophical writing in our age on the interrelation of poetry and the visual arts. Two other first rate books in this series are *The Survival of the Pagan Gods* by Jean Seznes ($6.50) and *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* by Erwin Goodenough (in three volumes: $25). Though the emphasis in all three books is on criticism, each is well illustrated with Volume III of the latter being exclusively one of illustrations of Jewish archeology and religious art which stylistically and symbolically set the foundations of much of Christian art. And a book as unique in subject matter as in pleasure for the reader is *Zen in the Art of Archery* by Eugen Herrigel (Pantheon; $2).

Lautrec by Hans Tietze (Beechhurst; $4.75) and *Van Gogh* by Frederick Wight (Beechhurst; $4.75) can be compared with the *Lautrec* and *Van Gogh* Skira small volumes: the Beechhurst volumes have fewer color plates, the advantage of a believable scale but a less convincing fidelity in color. Mr. Wight's essay on *Van Gogh* is better than M. Estienne's; but the Skira *Lautrec* gives a more convincing view of the artist. *El Greco* by Stewart Preston (Beechhurst; $4.75) seems to have the same limitations of the other two Beechhurst volumes, though there is no critical insight of a Frederick Wight to ameliorate the book.

Of the "pocket art books" for notice, two — *Utrillo* by Alfred Werner (Abrams; 50c) and *Dufy* by Alfred Werner (Abrams; 50c) — remind one that even though it is possible to display "infinite riches in a little room" it is also axiomatic that fiction is fiction be it the New York edition of Henry James or the pocket book edition of *Daisy Miller*. And though both these books are pleasant enough collections of reproductions in color though not as good as Abrams' more expensive and larger publications, one will wonder if a "museum for the pocket" is feasible.

Four books for notice which, in the thirties would have been called monographs but which now with improvements in bookmaking, in photography and through a rise in the general level of taste in art criticism, are important though specialized studies: *Russian Icons* (Oxford; $6.50), *Orozco* by MacKinley Helm (Harcourt, Brace; $7.50), *Leger* by Katherine Kuh (Illinois; $5.75), and *The Female Form in Painting* by Jean Cassou and Geoffrey Grigson (Harcourt, Brace; $4.95) are for the historian and the connoisseur—for the special person for whom it is usually difficult to find the appropriate gift. The *Orozco* and the *Leger* will be of increased value and appeal for all who have seen the fine retrospective exhibitions of each of these artists which have been or will be appearing in the large museums throughout America.

Art like truth needs many witnesses and the pleasant postulate that it is better, say, to see the mosaics of San Marco than to own M. Grabar's *Byzantine Painting* is joyful to debate at length with drinks after a very good dinner. But who is to say that everyone can travel to Venice. And besides, the twentieth century mind and perception are scaled to accept the part for nearly the whole.

ROBERT RICHMAN

"One of the few books on Soviet Russia that really explains what has been happening there."
—WILLIAM L. LANGER

THE DYNAMICS OF SOVIET SOCIETY

By W. W. ROSTOW,
in collaboration with ALFRED LEVIN, and with the assistance of others at the Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. "A really penetrating analysis . . . Absolutel first-rate and most interes ing."
—BARRINGTON MOORE,
$3.95 *at all bookstores*

NORTON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From Our Readers

► Catholics in Government

Methinks that the *New Republic*, ardent foe of McCarthyism, has descended to McCarthyesque tactics in its issue of December 7 in which it paints McCarthy's crusade as one as much anti-Protestant as anti-Communist. No evidence is cited, only such generalizations as "the Protestants say"—good enough for gossip columns, but not for the *New Republic*.

Note this gem: "A Protestant analysis of Foreign Operations Administration dismissals indicates that 80 percent involved Protestants; many of the Roman Catholics making up the remaining 20 percent were later rehired."

Are we to assume that all the dismissed individuals were affiliated with either Protestant or Catholic religions? No Jews or freethinkers? And, if not, then the dismissal record shows no bias in favor of Catholics for they constitute approximately 20 percent or less of the US population.

If *New Republic's* report about few Roman Catholics being dismissed from government posts is correct, then instead of painting our long-suffering government administrators as sycophants and cowards by saying they are appeasing McCarthy, reportedly a Catholic, why not interpret this phenomenon as a frank recognition that the Catholics with a deep-seated antipathy for and a long record against Communism can *a priori* be counted on as good security risks with a minimum of investigation? Certainly this is at least as logical as your correspondent's conclusion which he didn't even have the courage to voice directly.

McCarthy cannot be palmed off as a distinctly Catholic phenomenon. The two national Catholic news periodicals, *America* and *Commonweal* both deplore his tactics. McCarthy can be explained as all men like him have been explained before—he is politically ambitious and to promote his ambitions he is not aloof from demagoguery where it becomes necessary. To suggest that he is politically ambitious and anti-Protestant *both* is absurd, as *New Republic* editors will realize after a moment's reflection on the religious composition of the American electorate, or even that of Wisconsin.

By giving currency to rumors such as this, *New Republic* adds fuel to existing domestic tensions in the Blanshard pattern. Where Catholics and Protestants live together and work together as the denominational colleges are doing here in Kansas through co-operative fund-raising projects, we continuously find we have more than enough in common to respect each other as followers of Christ and loyal Americans. Why not accent the positive?

Atchison, Kans. EDWARD L. HENRY

► "Suds Bucket and a Mop"

No! No! No! No! A thousand times No! Never, please, never, mention the name of Sen. John Sparkman in the same breath as you mention "Kissing Jim" or "Big Jim" Folsom as you did in the December 7 issue of the *New Republic*. Such conjunction of names does Senator Sparkman a very grave injustice and is distinctly unfair to a man of his ability and ideals.

Senator Sparkman is a man of honesty and integrity, and is a capable leader in the US Senate. There are all too few of his type left, and it is inconceivable that any persons supporting him could in honesty support Folsom.

I was a resident of Alabama during Folsom's term as Governor, and I remember how I hung my head in shame whenever persons from other states asked me about Alabama's Governor. Nor was I alone in this feeling—it seemed to be the same with some 75 percent of the citizens. I remember the thousands of dollars which "disappeared," the Liquor Control Board scandals, the Pardon and Parole racket, the paternity cases, and all the other shameful examples which were so correctly named as "the rape of the century." Folsom's suds bucket and his mop, and his hill-billy band, his sleeping on the Court House steps, and his more or less public reprimand by Truman are all vivid in my mind. To associate this man with the liberal cause cannot but hurt the cause. If he is a liberal, then so is Joe McCarthy.

Folsom undoubtedly has support in Alabama, but if you dig down and find where this support really is you will find it in the vested interests and not in the liberals.

Atlanta, Ga. W. R. MACKAY

► One-Way Morality

In the contemporary global contest between the forces of light and the forces of darkness, this basic rule must be observed by all good statesmen and journalists: Use one expression to describe an action of the US Government and another term to describe a similar action performed by the Russian Government.

Take, for example, the latest Western proposal for a Big Four foreign ministers conference. We made the offer sincerely, in the interests of peace, of course. This would be one test of the Reds' sincerity. But now that they have agreed to the parley Washington asserts that their acceptance is simply another sinister maneuver, designed to create discord and weaken the West.

Malenkov's standing proposal (curiously backed by Churchill) for a top-level Big Three (or Big Four or more) meeting to attempt to resolve Cold War differences and reduce world tensions is termed by Dulles, *et al*, merely "insincere, diversionary strategy"; there must be prerequisites to any such conference involving Soviet concessions on Austria, Germany, Indo-China, free elections, etc. Of course when the Russians at first requested that the rearmament of their two-time invaders and ravagers, the Germans, at least be delayed until after the projected ministers meeting had a chance to discuss a German settlement—this was to Dulles an unjust attempt to set prior conditions.

Russia has spies in the USA; but we have "intelligence officers" in Russia. We want peace; the Russians want "peace." Our ring of bases around the Red Empire (as C. E. Wilson readily calls it), and our military alliances—including those with Franco, Chiang, etc.—are merely necessary defensive measures of the Free World; however the Sino-Russian alliance, *e. g.*, is aggressive in nature. We have allies; they have only satellites. While Communist aggression against our European allies is a great danger which we must guard against, "liberation" of Russia's satellites would be an immense blessing and is an idea worth considering. US motives are, at worst, those of enlightened

(*Continued on page 23*)

REPRINTS NOW AVAILABLE

Of New Republic's Report on "The Trial of Harry Truman"

IMPORTANT FOR '54—a careful analysis of the facts and the background of the Truman-Brownell controversy on Communism in Government. Order copies for your friends, members of your organization, for every voter you know. 10c each, $8 per 100, $60 per 1,000. Order from

NEW REPUBLIC • 1824 Jefferson Pl NW • Washington 6, DC

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To Our Readers

The item in the *New Republic* about discrimination in favor of Catholics in loyalty firings has drawn many comments. Some critics maintain we are afraid of telling the truth about the Catholic Church and urge us to tell all we know. Others maintain that we are stooping to McCarthyism in noting that Catholics are given biased treatment. Still others, such as Professor Henry, maintain that the bias is justified. His view seems the most accurate and logical, but the dangers are obvious and reliance on this test alone is surely unsound. A man who will deceive the government will presumably be ready to deceive the Church.

Proof on this matter is almost impossible to produce. We are making a thorough survey of our own which we hope to publish early in 1954.

* * *

I had wondered until this week who would inherit the earth when men destroy themselves in atomic war. Reading through *Nucleonics* in the Library of Congress for this week's editorial, I found the answer: *Habrocabron.*

If you are exposed to radioactivity of more than 600 Roentgen units you will die in great pain. But not *Habrocabron.* Robert L. Sullivan and Daniel S. Grosch, two biologists of North Carolina State University, subjected the haploid males and diploid females of *Habrocabron,* a parasitic wasp, to intense radiation. The resulting cytogenetic situation they concluded was of great interest.

At 54,000 units the male wasps became a little sluggish; half an hour later they were right as rain. In fact, doses of X-ray treatment that would kill us increased *Habrocabron's* life span.

The reason, if you are interested, is this: you are vulnerable in your dependence on mitotically active cells and your relatively primitive tissue. But *Habrocabron* (like most insects) has no obligate replaceable epithelium, no complicated mucous membrane, no hematopoiesis and no lymphatic system. His body surface is a non-living cuticle. And so the future belongs to him.

* * *

"Of course our allies are sending strategic goods to China," said Senator McCarthy on "Meet the Press" last night. "Why Frank Nash came from the Pentagon to tell us that just recently a shipload of fertilizer blew up on its way to China—mighty funny fertilizer!"

"Nonsense!" cried the scientist who was sitting beside me, "fertilizer is highly unstable!"

You'd think McCarthy would know.

m. s.

LETTERS

(Continued from page 22)

self-interest; Soviet motives are always imperialistic.

Americans—in and out of the government—may openly call for war with Russia or China, but a relatively roughly-worded speech by Bulganin or Molotov criticizing the West in some measure (far, far from the warlike threats of Gordon Dean, General Grow, and the American Legion head) appears to shock the sensitivities of some supposedly hardened politicos and newspapermen here, and is interpreted as "proof" of Russia's hypocrisy and insincerity concerning peace with the West. Needless to say, such a speech must necessarily be a pack of lies—as opposed to the gems flowing from the lips of our Secretary of State or Defense at all times.

We build up our arms, our A- and H-bombs, our guided missiles, our bacteriological and chemical weapons solely for defense; the USSR builds up those same weapons for aggression. We arm for peace; they arm for war. While it would be a heinous atrocity for the Russian air corps to drop an H-bomb on New York, exterminating its men, women and children (and this is undeniable), yet our Air Force would under certain conditions itself be morally justified in "using" such a weapon—when dropped on Moscow!

Washington introduces its disarmament and other proposals desiring to end the threat of war and to achieve lasting peace. Moscow's proposals, however, are always "insincere," an attempt to "sow discord," the "same old propaganda," etc. One recalls Eisenhower's pledges months ago to "take at face value" all Russian proposals which might reduce the danger of war, and to meet the Russians "halfway"—physically and otherwise. Direct negotiation should be welcomed if we desire peace and wish to end the Cold War which, at the best, is costing the world "the sweat of its labors, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children" (April 16, 1953). Then followed a continuous struggle between President Ike, man of peace, and Secretary of State Dulles, the prophet of doom, the man who seemingly feared negotiation, lest it relax tensions and slow up rearmament and even achieve disarmament. Is it possible that the former (?) chief advocate of a policy of "liberation" has won out and is now dictating our foreign policy to our honest but weak Chief Executive?

Whatever Russia proposes, we seem automatically to propose the opposite, whether good or bad. Whatever step the Russians may take, ours is taken in opposition, the needs of the world notwithstanding. (If this isn't dictation from Moscow, I don't know what is!) The result is a tendency to think in terms of a nation of demi-gods *v.* a nation of demons. We begin to look upon the end of anti-"Communism" as justifying the means used. There naturally emerges a dual set of standards: Not only is even a worthwhile measure or proposal or a friendly gesture of a Red Government (there are such things, as Malenkov has shown since last March) painted in the most sinister way, but a deed that is correctly regarded as wrong for *them* to do, is considered proper and just when *we* or our government does it; injustice is attacked *there,* but often condoned *here.* How long will we tolerate this one-way morality?

Brooklyn, N. Y. PAUL WARREN

► Christmas Card Shower

Yesterday I read in the paper that ex-President Truman has aged visibly since his loyalty was attacked by Attorney General Brownell. May I suggest that all of us, even those of us who weren't exactly "wild about Harry"—that all of us send him Christmas cards with just a word about our belief in his loyalty. I'm sure a nationwide Christmas card shower would cheer him up.

Hollywood, Calif. M. G. STILES

INVEST as you EARN

You can do something now about making your retirement dreams come true. You can begin building an investment in Mutual Fund Shares, either outright or through a plan for periodic purchases . . . a plan designed to produce dividend income within the limits of market risk to help you work toward a sounder financial future. Mail this ad for full information to:

BENGSTON & COMPANY
(Incorporated 1946)
55 West 55th Street New York 19, N. Y.

ORANGES AND GRAPEFRUIT

TOP GRADE, TREE RIPENED, INDIAN RIVER GRAPEFRUIT AND ORANGES, freshly picked, tastefully packed. Grand for eating, juice, gifts. Guaranteed. Express prepaid. Bushel $7.00. Half bushel $4.75. (East of Miss.)
James H. Hart
Island Groves, Route 2, Cocoa, Florida.

ORANGES, GRAPEFRUIT, tree ripened, freshly picked, uncolored, $2.50 bushel FOB groves, RIOLEMBOS, Box 161, Palatka, Florida.

MAGAZINE

"WHAT IS INFORMATION"—lead article in the Special Issue on Information Theory in current issue of **ETC.,** official quarterly journal of Int'l. Society for General Semantics, edited by S. I. Hayakawa. Read how language forms limit thought, behavior. $4 a year; trial issue $1. Write **ETC.,** Dept. 22, 400 W. North Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

CLASSIFIED RATES

Per word (single insertion).....12c
Per word 6 times in one contract year.....11c
Per word 13 times in one contract year.....1(
Per word 26 times in one contract year.....
Per word 52 times in one contract year.....

ADVERTISING DEPT.
New Republic 230 W. 41 St. N

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"... The most brilliant essay in existence on the anatomy and internal contradictions of European Communism."

—The Economist

YOU SAVE $1.50 ON THIS POLITICAL BOOK CLUB SECTION

"EUROPEAN COMMUNISM"

What Other Reviewers Say:

- ". . . a brilliant picture of Russian policy, painted with full knowledge and proper perspective . . ."—*The Boston Post*
- "(Franz Borkenau) has an intimate knowledge of the working of the Communist machine and the Communist mind."—*The New Republic*
- ". . . he has a profound understanding . . . of the men in the Kremlin.—*The New Yorker*
- "Should be compulsory reading for every statesman and politician of the free world. A massive survey of Russian policy . . ."—*Time & Tide*

Watch for New Selections by Our Eminent Book Club Judges!

GERALD W. JOHNSON, formerly editorial writer for the BALTIMORE SUN, weekly TV commentator, critic, author of many works on American history and politics, including "Liberal's Progress," "The American People," "Roosevelt, Dictator or Democrat."

MAX LERNER, professor of American Civilization at Brandeis University, nationally known lecturer and syndicated columnist. Author of "It's Later Than You Think,' "Ideas Are Weapons," "The Mind and faith of Justice Holmes" and other books.

MICHAEL STRAIGHT, editor of NEW REPUBLIC, author of "Make This the Last War." White House Assistant in Interior Department, Past National Chairman, American Veterans Committee.

At the Special Book Club Price of Only

$4.50

Regularly $6 **You Save $1.50!**

A *MUST* FOR YOUR LIBRARY! Now, as a reader of *New Republic,* you can save $1.50 on the book that has been called "the most brilliant essay in existence on the anatomy and internal contradictions of European Communism." The first selection by our judges for the Political Book Club demonstrates how you will be able to save on the kinds of books you want for your own library. Remember . . . you don't have to "join" the NR Political Book Club—and there's no minimum number of books to buy. You order only the books you want, as new titles are recommended by our eminent judges.

ORDER YOUR COPY TODAY of *European Communism.* If you're not a regular *New Republic* subscriber, here's another reason for not missing a single issue of this magazine. The moment you subscribe you are entitled to Political Book Club privileges—and the opportunity to save almost enough on purchases to pay for an entire subscription.

MAIL THIS COUPON TODAY

NEW REPUBLIC, 230 W. 41st St., New York 36, N. Y.

I am an NR reader. Send me "European Communism" for $4.50.
Check enclosed ☐ COD (postage extra) ☐

I want to subscribe to NR for 1 year ($7) ☐ 2 years ($12) ☐
Send me "European Communism," too, $4.50 ☐

Check enclosed ☐ Bill me (postage extra for book) ☐

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY..... ZONE..... STATE.....

NRB 21

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED